

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus*.

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke*.

No. 9.

DECEMBER 1931.

VOL. XXI.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

THE REFORMATION AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

The choice of 'The Reformation' as the subject of the Modern Churchmen's Conference next year has much to commend it. For the last hundred years Englishmen have witnessed with resentment the attempt to undo the work of the Reformation in this country.

For the first sixty years of that period opposition was violent and intolerant, for the last forty it has mainly been one of contemptuous indifference. The attitude of a man whose wife has become personally distasteful to him and whom he suspects of being unfaithful, but as he has ceased to love her and is not in love with anyone else, he feels indisposed to put himself to the trouble and scandal of securing a divorce. That spirit of resentment and distrust on the part of the nation flared up momentarily in the two-fold rejection of the Deposited Book by the House of Commons. The bulk of the bishops, who live in the atmosphere of their *entourage* which is adulatory and optimistic, were deeply pained and surprised. They did not see why they should be thwarted by the *canaille* of the Protestant underworld—people who were not English Churchmen. Yet these people really represented the millions of disgruntled and distrustful Churchmen who are resolved to do nothing to help the Church, but are ready to take advantage of any opportunity to do her harm. No small factor in this feeling is the conviction that the Church has gone back on the Reformation: that the Bishops by their sup-

port of this infidelity in some cases and by their failure to check it in others have the heaviest responsibility for what has happened. There is not a little in the way of hard facts to support these charges. The reader of the *Church Times* can find abundant evidence of it. The approaching celebrations of the centenary of the Oxford Movement will supply much more in a way which is sure to catch the public eye.

As Modernists, we believe primarily in education as the preliminary to true progress. The eyes of both Church and Nation ought to be turned again to a study of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, and not least in relation to the English Church and Nation. The Reformation to the student of history is not what the Roman controversialist, like Mr. Hilaire Belloc, or the Protestant controversialist, believes it to be. It was as Mr. Augustine Birrell has called it, 'a barbarously conducted' affair, and that on both sides; but the blood-stained combatants were fighting for principles and fighting with extraordinary skill and courage. In Northern Europe the Reformers triumphed, but there is no student of history who would not admit that there was loss as well as gain in that triumph. One aspect of what is regarded as disloyalty to the Reformation has been an effort to remedy the Reformation's losses without jeopardizing its gains. This recuperative movement has taken on many forms. It has been aesthetic on one side, devotional on another, doctrinal on another. It has been loyal in some cases, deeply disloyal in others. It has been done mainly by free lances, by secret societies, and by a partisan press. The defects of these methods are abundantly manifest in the results. Eccentric, clandestine, obscurantist efforts to undo the effects of the Reformation are apparent on all sides. Enlightened efforts to pass beyond its limitations, to carry its principles further than the sixteenth century Reformers visualized, are equally apparent.

In the light of our modern knowledge and modern outlook it is high time that the Church authorities in a spirit of disinterested sincerity and enlightened investigation faced the problem of the true relation of the Church of England to the Reformation, and decided with intelligence and courage how far those principles should be adhered to and wherein they ought to be developed or modified to-day. At present there is a tendency in clerical cir-

cles to ignore the Reformation, or to regret it, but there is no openly expressed, unflinching resolution to adhere to its principles as a great liberating and enlightening Christian movement for which we English Churchmen ought to be profoundly grateful. The recovery of a right attitude to the Reformation on the part of our Church leaders can only be achieved by a re-consideration of that great movement. With the recovery of that right attitude there will be granted to the English Church the power to regain the confidence of the English nation.

We hope that the Modern Churchmen's Conference, which is to be held at Bristol, September 5—10, 1932, will do much not only to direct public attention to the aims of the Reformation, but also to secure a re-orientation of English Church sentiment and ideals of Christian development in harmony with principles which the Reformation recovered and re-constructed, but did not discover.

Dr. Coulton's many volumes have helped not a little to provide material for such a study, and no Modernist will neglect them. Perhaps the best book to begin with as a general introduction to the study of the Reformation is Charles Beard's *The Reformation in the Sixteenth Century in its Relation to Modern Thought and Knowledge*. (Hibbert Lectures, published by Williams and Norgate.) It is as remarkable for its sound learning as for its grasp of general principles and dispassionate judgment.

LIBERTY WITHOUT LIFE.

Lord Wolmer, Chairman of the Church Self-Government League, who both in his virtues and in his limitations reminds his political friends of that estimable character, the younger Cato, has just inaugurated a new campaign for the liberation of the Church of England from the control of Parliament.

English clericalist idealists will doubtless support the campaign enthusiastically. What can be more ideal than a Free Church in a Free State? Practical Churchmen will not only hesitate to support such a campaign, but will oppose it vigorously. They do not believe that it is possible to persuade the State to give the present Church of England more freedom in relation to the State than she possesses to-day.

But even if it were possible to get the State to do this, they believe that it would be a *donum exitiale* to the Church. The Church of England would not profit by an increase in episcopal autocracy and bureaucratic centralization. Many of the clergy of all schools are becoming conscious that there is too much of both at present, and they do not wish to facilitate the tendency.

To increase the external freedom of the Church in relation to the State, would inevitably lead to the reduction of freedom within the Church itself. The Bishop would steadily dominate the Diocese: the strongest ecclesiastical party would crush out all others: the parochial clergy ground down between the upper-millstone of the Bishop and his officials and the nether-millstone of the parochial laity, would indeed be slaves, but not of the slaves of God but of intolerable and paralyzing conditions. This would inevitably lead to a decline in the quality of the clergy in this country and in the moral and spiritual influence of the Church. The ambitious and the servile could live and thrive in such an atmosphere, but the more virile and intelligent members of the English educated classes would choose some other profession than the ministry. We could wish that Lord Wolmer and his friends, the Bishop of Winchester and the Bishop of Durham, would 'leave well-enough alone' in the relations of Church and State, and recognize that it was only the blundering of the Bishops which produced the humiliating rebuff which the Church experienced at the hands of Parliament, and nothing radically wrong in the existing relation between Church and State. 'The bad workman complains of his tools,' but his unfortunate employer discovers too late the real cause of the botched work.

Those who have served in the non-established Churches of the Anglican communion do not wish to see the Church of England reduced to their level. We have no desire to expose their weaknesses and point to their declining influence on the national life of the great and growing communities in which they exist. Romanism can flourish without establishment, Protestant Dissent can also flourish without establishment, but the English Church cannot. The reason is manifest. The Roman Church is imperialist in its tone and temper. Protestant Dissent is denominationalist and individualist in its tone and temper, but the

Church of England is essentially national in its tone and temper. It exists primarily to serve the moral and spiritual interests of the nation. It is the *ecclesia gentis Anglorum*—a phrase coined by the Venerable Bede. In close relation to the national life it lives; separated from that national life it dies.

Disestablishment is an important and decisive step towards the securing of such a separation. It is an act of divorce detrimental to both parties. After the divorce the State will wed Secularism, and the Church Clericalism, and, as a consequence, the realization of the ideal of a Christian nation will recede steadily into the background.

No unprejudiced student of the religious situation to-day can feel satisfied with the moral and spiritual condition of a nation in which either Papal imperialism or Protestant denominationalism is the sole representative of Christianity. They both breed secularism: the one by its tyrannical temper; the other by its debilitating divisions. There are no doubt weaknesses in the national Churches—Erastianism, nationalism, pedestrianism—but these can be cured and have been cured in the Church of England by the many moral and spiritual movements which her more heroic and spiritually-minded sons have initiated and propagated.

We could wish that our fellow-Churchmen of all schools would realize that cutting the Gordian knot of the Establishment or even the attempt of Lord Wolmer and his friends to untie it, provides no real remedy for our Church's infirmities: such an achievement would only accentuate them all. Discerning lovers of the Church of England have no wish to see her exchange the girdle of Establishment for the shroud of Dissolution.

There are, we are glad to observe, indications that the more reflecting Anglo-Catholics are beginning to recognize that a fanatical demand for immediate liberation at any price, such as Dr. Henson voices, would lead to Disestablishment and Disendowment, followed by the Disruption and possibly even the ultimate Disappearance of what Dean Church once called 'the most splendid Church of Christendom.'

The *Church Times*, in its leading article of 27th November dealing with Lord Wolmer's campaign, makes a number of statements with which we are in hearty agreement. It is true that

the article is, in some of its parts, defaced by certain ignorant prejudices, *e.g.* that the Kirk of Scotland in 1560 was a new creation, and that our Sovereign is not under Christ its supreme governor. But after excising these statements and a few familiar jibes at Evangelicals and Modernists, we do not think the fallacies underlying Lord Wolmer's policy of demanding, under existing circumstances, for the Church of England that freedom from Parliamentary control, which the Kirk of Scotland enjoys, could be better stated.

'The circumstances in England and in Scotland are almost wholly different . . . Scotland . . . is almost completely agreed on doctrine, and that in a Protestant sense. The State, which is predominantly Protestant in tradition, had no ground for jealousy or suspicion in yielding to the Kirk's claims for freedom.

'Two further considerations combined to make the House of Commons much more ready to pass the Scottish Church Act of 1921 than it is ever likely to be, if asked to perform a corresponding service for the Church of England. The Presbyterian system, unlike that of the Church of England, assigns great power to the lay element. This is a fact which appeals strongly to the political sense of a British House of Commons. Moreover, the Kirk was unanimous in its demand for autonomy; the Church of England as yet is not unanimous . . . The House of Commons, as Sir John Birchall most rightly said, would pass anything for a united Church, but nothing of importance for a divided one.

'There is therefore no hope whatever for the apocalyptic passage of a comprehensive Spiritual Freedom Bill, comparable to that of the Enabling Act . . . The idea of the single glorious victory must be abandoned.

'We do not believe that the State is likely to disestablish the Church, unless the Church disestablishes itself. The problem of the appointment of Bishops can be solved, if it is handled with intelligent statesmanship. The moral authority of Church Courts can be restored if, and when, there is voluntary recognition of a satisfactory court of appeal. If the Church creates a satisfactory court for itself, Parliament will be only too glad to support its authority. When the Church has reformed her own patronage, and the reforms are shown to work, it will be inevitable that Crown patronage should conform.

'Along such practical lines there is substantial hope of real advance being made.'

We hope that our Disestablishing brethren will weigh well these wise words of the *Church Times*, coming as they do to them from a source which is for them oracular, although perhaps not always infallible.

VON HÜGEL AND THE GREAT QUEST*

THE greatness of von Hügel seems to me to consist in the nobility of his Quest; in the fidelity with which he pursued it; in the selflessness and disinterestedness of his pursuit; in the solidarity he described to all the faculties of body and soul in the exercise of that Quest.

It is true that all are called to take some part in that Quest unless they utterly deny that life has any spiritual or eternal meaning. But the number of those who take an open-eyed and conscious part therein is comparatively small. Life pursues its course, following a narrow band or pathway set between immensities and conflicting forces. We have the huge, the crushing material immensities on the one hand, moving ruthlessly on their own way, reckless, to all appearance, of all that to us spells life and death. Even on our own earth there is enough to stagger us. To visit a land where Nature has not yet been harnessed to the purposes of man, where human life has not yet acquired the blinding sedative of use and wont, is to realize the difficulties of spiritual faith. How easy to doubt!

Then we have the bewildering web of what we will call human fate, with its long-drawn tale of pitiful suffering and horrible cruelty—a tale to which many, happily for themselves, never listen—a tale which has been unfolded with such appalling force by those who have dared to tell it. Take the terrible scene between Ivan and his pious brother Aloysha in the ‘*Brothers Karamazoff*,’ when the former pours out, one after the other, awful anecdotes of cruelty and tells the latter why he renounces ‘the higher harmony.’ ‘I don’t want harmony. From love of humanity I don’t want it. I would rather be left with my unavenged suffering and unsatisfied indignation.’ Once more, how easy to doubt!

And then we have the great scientific and metaphysical and historical problems; and we can look into the whirlpool of scepticism into which it would be so easy to fall. And again, how easy to doubt.

Some are not called on to face the awful facts. Some face

* A résumé of part of a lecture delivered to the Modern Churchmen’s Union at Worthing.

them but partially, and do not allow their full force to sink into their souls; there are many semi-blind defenders of the spiritual world. But there is a small number of the heroic seekers who look the worst in the face, and yet save their souls alive, and other souls along with them. He was one of them—loyal to scientific and historical as well as spiritual truth. The first canon of his spiritual philosophy was to assign to each category of truth its own position and rights. Let religion, indeed, be supreme, but let it not be tyrant or usurper. The following passage, from a long review of Professor Eucken's philosophy, written in 1896, is a good summary of his own :

As to the form and position to be claimed for religion, thus declared to be the absolutely necessary implication, consummation and guarantee of all our spiritual life, its Augustinian and mediaeval form is found to be problematic in this, that it not only rightly extends its modes of thought and feeling to the whole of life, but that it also wrongly makes these modes so exclusive as to destroy, as far as in it lies, all interest in the specific nature of the external world. For with this all incentive to explore and work at this world falls away; the breadth of reality remains uncultivated and unrevealed. Religion thus can, at best, but appropriate and use an existing civilization; it cannot of itself produce, or even further, culture.

And in a letter to myself he wrote :

Hence religion will come to see that it cannot attain to its own depth, it cannot become the *chief* thing, if it does not continually renounce to being *everything*.

A corollary of these principles was his continued insistence on the *costingness* of all deep religious thought, as, indeed, of all thought whatsoever. The word *costing* was a favourite one in his vocabulary; indeed, so greatly did he believe that nothing in the spiritual world can be gained without adequate payment, that it would almost seem at times as though he inverted the proposition and made of *costingness* actually a proof of truth. Again, in remarks on Eucken, he pointed out to me the inevitable 'non-fit, the friction and otherness of science and religion'—the continued battle demanded for their adjustment—and then he breaks into almost a paean of exultation over this inevitable conflict, for :

Thus the Cross gets planted right into our intellectual life also; for is it not a cross—but, like all crosses, bringing with it the joy of life—to renounce day and night to any adequation between experience and analysis or synthesis . . . between the determinism of matter and the libertarianism of spirit.

Man attains in religion . . . in proportion as he seeks not too directly, not feverishly and strainingly, but in a largely subconscious,

waiting, genial, expansive, endlessly patient, sunny manner. This is indeed the 'gütliche nicht grimmige Ernst' of the great German mediaeval mystics.'¹

He advocated, thus, ceaseless effort; but he also taught the need of immense self-control—there was to be no irritability, no impatience in our quest.

And I remember his saying to me, when I once expressed to him something of that agonizing desire for certainty as to the future, when one loses a friend, how to his mind this very desire was hostile to its own fulfilment, and that the trust in immortality was rather begotten by trust in God than by any other consideration.

So far as to the method of the Quest, and its object was Reality—nothing else would do—reality in the sense of a real existence of the object, independently of the mind that observed it. His posthumous work, entitled *The Reality of God*, is well named in so far as the name resumes the work of his life. It is not in all ways fully worthy of him—it marks a decline—but it is, as it were, his last watchword.

He deals, first, with the reality of the outer world. He had a great love of science, and would easily have become absorbed in any one of what were to him its favourite branches. But all would have been to him but idle knowledge without that sense of underlying and abiding reality—a reality he joyfully recognizes when he returns again to a science that he has abandoned for a time, and finds, with all its progress, the something unchanging that remains. Hence an inter-communion of all realities :

The higher a real being is in the scale of existence, the more numerous, the more active and powerful are its relations with other realities.

And just before he said :

I trust the reader sees what I am driving at—a universal law of existence.

And further on :

It is all this in its interconnection and interaction, in its place, again, in our earth's general existence, and of this again in the universe of worlds, it is this reality—reality at every step and within everything—it is this that is worth living for.

And in this, his scientific character and outlook, we have, in the world of physical knowledge, the counterpart of his insistence on the notion of transcendency in the religious order.

¹ *On the Place and Function of History and Institutions*, 'Essays and Addresses.'

For that great world, which he loved so much to study, would have had no value or meaning for him if it had not been, in its own measure, transcendent—outside and beyond and independent of the mind that regarded it. The world was thus, for him, an enthralling object of study just because of its resistance; for as we must fight Nature if we would use her, so must we fight her to understand her. Nor can she be thus understood by purely religious effort—this would be to do exactly what we must not do—to make religion, not the chief thing, but everything. Nature is not God, nor a part of God; she is His creature, but she seems often, to our minds, an alien and hostile creature. If we want to find God in her and behind her, we seem, at times, to have to find Him in spite of her.

There are dykes, mountains, forests through which, over which, we have to pass.

In the beginning God made the Heavens and the earth and all things that dwell therein.

I am afraid that some of our religious teachers evade the full meaning of this great truth. They admit, indeed, that God turned out this vast universe as a German toymaker turns out a Noah's Ark but they do not recognize that God has given to His creation a living force of its own. We are not little masters of the world; we are mites—intelligent mites, indeed, but mites in the midst of a vast universe. Von Hügel had the scientific outlook, but he was not going to deny, either in the interests of science or in the interests of religion, that the world was God's creature. Nor was he going to keep his scientific knowledge in one cupboard and his religious knowledge in another—hence what remained was to make his way over the mountains, through the woods, over the wide rivers to the Feet of God. And he loved, on this question, to invoke the doctrine of the Cross—the two lines of life which traverse each other, upwards and across, with the divine Figure fastened on them.

I will quote here some lines from a letter to myself which is, I proudly maintain, one of the grandest he ever wrote. 'Religion everything? or but one thing among other things?' (This was my question, as he quotes it. The discussion was on the philosophy of Rudolf Eucken.) He goes on:

I consider this as the '*articulus stantis vel cadentis*' [of his and Eucken's position] and the point on which depends the future true and lasting peace between Faith and Science, and the introduction of

the Christian ethical, the divine spirit of the Child and the Cross, right into the still largely pagan intellectual life of the Church. Pray notice, first, that when we say we believe in the Creation, especially when we profess belief in each single soul's free will, we profess the mysterious belief that God has somehow alienated a certain amount of His own power, and given it a relative independence of its own; that He has, as it were, set up . . . obstacles, limits, friction against Himself. And thus we may still wonder at the mysteriously thin barrier between our poor finite relativity and the engulfing, infinite Absolute—a barrier which is necessary . . . for God is no more God for us if we cease to be relatively distinct from Him. Let the drop be lost in the ocean, and for the drop there is no more either ocean or drop.

. . . And note further that this poor little shelter of reeds, with the absolute sun burning down upon it: this poor little paper boat on the sea of the infinite—God took pity upon them . . . God wanted to give them relative independence and quasi absolute worth.

Thus for von Hügel no evasion was permissible—the material world lay before us, in one sense totally impregnable, and yet, in its way, a teacher of religious truth. And if Nature was thus transcendent, how much more so was God? Yes, for von Hügel our conception of God must utterly transcend our notions of humanity and all created life and being.

I think I may say that I witnessed in him a steadily growing recoil from immanentistic conceptions of God; a recoil so vigorous as to render him sometimes suspicious of other religious writers. He had, perhaps, like many of us, passed through a phase of immanentism, in which one seeks God almost exclusively in one's own soul. But with him it would have been a very brief stage. Both immanentism in its extreme form and pantheism—which is a wider form of immanentism—were his spiritual bugbears. And this because he considered that immanentism made for unreality—and reality was his one abiding Quest.

His doctrine, with which most of us are well acquainted, of the Institutional element in religion may be said to be connected with this insistence on reality. He knew that the contrary of the religion of institutionalism, and consequently of authority, was a religion of pure spirit, and hence an immanentistic religion. In an exclusively interior religion we are, comparatively, masters, and we have not to compare our own ideas with outstanding doctrines and dogmas. A church is something that imposes itself in virtue of its separate reality; through it religion is carried on from past, through present and into future. It is the support of weakness, the safeguard against individual cap-

rice, the means of communion of souls with one another and with God.

I think it was this conviction which lay at the base of much which was disconcerting to some of us in von Hügel's later life, after the culminating tragedy of Modernism in our Church. He was a cautious, prudent man; he saw the dangers of homelessness, and he put safety first. The old Catechism dictum resumed its force—'better to lose the whole world than to suffer the loss of one's own soul'; better, he thought, to be silent than to speak at too great a risk; better to leave truth in God's hands than proclaim it at the cost of such spiritual help as could only be obtained by the sacraments, and might be forfeited by excessive zeal and candour. I feel, and have ever felt, thankful that he had not to suffer, in his own person, this grievous loss.

But a question which may here be asked is whether he did not over-much stress the notion of *otherness* as essential to the notion of *reality*; and it is here that I have ever noted certain characteristics of his religious thought which seem to me to differentiate him from the mystic in the full sense of the word. I certainly scandalized one writer on von Hügel by, as he put it, denying to von Hügel the mystical temper; I may have scandalized others as well. When I read the remark of that writer I asked myself if I had been guilty indeed of a misjudgment; and I have since then considered the matter anew. It seems to me, on reflection, that I cannot quite alter my opinion until I am further convinced of its injustice, and that there are certain qualities of von Hügel's mind in this respect that are contrary to the truly mystical temper. He was, of course, a mystic in so far as we mean by that term one who lives in the presence of spiritual realities; in so far as mysticism is just the inner life of the soul, not many could possess it more abundantly. But I am thinking in this place of that mysticism, whether of doctrine or of actual practice, which outstrips the ordinary course of the spiritual life; which becomes a life of its own, fed by methods of more directly Divine influence and inspiration than those of the ordinary devout soul.

We have such mystics in the pagan world; we have such mystics in every denomination of the Christian world; and they are all so wondrously alike in certain respects that it is surely indicative of some common apprehension and realization. Now

certain qualities of such mysticism seem to me to be (a) an utter disregard for all conventional safeguards; (b) a forgetfulness, though not therefore a contempt, of law; (c) a disregard for danger of any kind, material or immaterial; (d) and, what I cannot but regard as almost a main characteristic of mysticism at its highest development, an abandonment of the entire self to some deeply-felt and experienced, but not clearly apprehended, reality; (e) lastly, such an effort after union with this reality as entails an at least apparent disregard for the safeguarding of personality, even if there be a profound confidence in its ultimate preservation.

Now to my mind von Hügel was far too cautious a teacher in the spiritual order to accept such conditions; they do, in fact, run counter to what he regarded as the fitting religion of the human soul. He would have mind and will ever in control of the situation; he would keep body and soul, with all their faculties, ever harmoniously at work. Take the following passage from *The Mystical Element of Religion*:

It will be found, I think, that the quite undeniable abuses that have been special to the ascetic and contemplative methods and states, have all primarily sprung from that most plausible error that, if these energizings are, in a sense, the highest in and for man, then they can, at least in man's ideal action and condition, dispense with other and lower energizings and objects altogether. Yet both for man's practice here, and even for his ideal state in the hereafter, this is not so.

Very important for the understanding of von Hügel's mind on all this question is his treatment of the doctrine of St. John of the Cross. Now I suppose most of us would recognize in St. John of the Cross one of the greatest mystical teachers of Christianity; and it is significant, to my mind, that the Baron treats him, indeed with reverence and respect, but also with a certain caution and reserve. Indeed, there is a certain politeness and deference in his attitude to this great teacher which I am inclined to associate with a modicum of distrust; for von Hügel carried with him an inheritance of diplomatic traditions and was always courteous and regardful in his criticism.

Now speaking of St. John of the Cross, he says, after citing a passage from 'The Ascent of Mount Carmel,' that it is certain that St. John of the Cross is one of the greatest of . . . contemplatives, and that neither his intuition and actual practice, nor even his sayings (so long as any one saying belonging to one trend is set off against another belonging to the other trend), contravenes the Christian and Catholic positions. . . . Yet were we to press his

'negative way' into becoming the only one; and especially were we to take, without discount, such a virtual repudiation, as is furnished by any insistence on the above words, of any essential, objective difference in value between our various apprehensions of Him and approaches to Him; the whole system and *rationale* of External, Sacramental and Historical Religion—indeed, of the Incarnation in any degree and form—would have to go as so many stumbling-blocks to the soul's advance.

His criticism is just; but is it not a criticism, not only of St. John of the Cross and his like, but of every mystic at his deepest and most complete expression and experience? Does not the religion of every such mystic reach a point when he has, as it were, to step off the edge of the world—on to what? Into what? 'I know not—God knoweth.' It is vain to suggest caution to the soul that has reached this stage; it is vain to summon him back from his course, even in the name of the Sacramental system; even in the name of the Incarnation. He is not repudiating one or the other; it is, with the Christian, in virtue of them that he has reached the stage at which we find him, the point at which we are about to lose him. But he is out of hearing of every appeal to caution; he knows the meaning of faith, but he has lost all sense of the word orthodoxy.

In another place von Hügel quotes the following passage from 'The Ascent of Mount Carmel':

Let the faithful soul take care that, whilst contemplating an image, the senses be not absorbed in it, whether it be material or in the imagination, and whether the devotion it excites be spiritual or sensible. Let him venerate the image as the Church commands, and lift up his mind at once from the material image to those whom it represents. He who shall do this will never be deluded.

To this von Hügel affixes the following comment:

Here again, along the line of argument absorbing the saint in this book, there is no fully logical ground left for the Incarnational, Historical, Sacramental scheme of the Infinite immanent in the finite, and of spirit stimulated in contact with matter, with everywhere the need of the condescensions of God and of our ascensions by means of careful attention to them.

And as regards the strongly unitive tendency of mysticism, he says: But what concerns us here is the question whether the complete action of the soul (if man would grow in accordance with his ineradicable nature, environment, and specific grace and call) does not as truly involve a corresponding counter-movement to this intensely unitive and intuitive movement which, with most men, and in most moments of even the minority of men, forms but an indirectly willed condition and spontaneous background of the soul.

This seems to me sound criticism as applied to a reasoned and

systematic religion; but the mystic is dealing with ultimates—with the attainment, and not with the process. In and through that unitive instinct he receives the highest apprehension of eternity and pledge of immortality.

There are two other points on which I seem to find, just by reason of this quality of cautiousness, a certain limitation in von Hügel's outlook. These are, first, his treatment of agnosticism, and, next, that of ethical problems.

(a) The latter half of his posthumous work is devoted to an examination of agnosticism as presented in the life and thought of Sir Alfred Lyall, and I ask myself whether he realized the element of agnosticism that can co-exist with faith, and the element of faith that can co-exist with agnosticism. He refers to that poignant little poem, *Theology in extremis*, where the Christian dies for his faith while doubting it:

Life is pleasant, and friends may be nigh,
Fain would I speak one word and be spared,
Yet I could be silent and cheerfully die
If I were only sure God cared;
If I had faith and were only certain
That light is behind that terrible curtain.

(b) And as to ethical problems, of which many are tormenting and insistent at the present day, he was intransigent—he allowed of no possible change of outlook. In this he differed from Fr. Tyrrell, who, with his priestly experience, came in contact with moral questions that do vary in various places.

But on all these points we have just the defects—if such they may be termed—which correspond to his great qualities, one of which was his determination never to choose the easier path, even though he sometimes chose the safer one; never to follow the line of inclination and indulgence; never to draw down faith or morals to our own low level. For, to conclude this study, which is by no means exhaustive, let us note, as the last point, that von Hügel was a great fighter. In his early youth he underwent the great Vigil of Arms and consecrated himself, body and soul, to the one sacred Quest. Men like Tyrrell belonged to the Cavalry or Air Forces in the Great Combat; von Hügel was of the heavy Infantry—feet firmly planted on earth, but ready for the advance; eyes wide open to the Quest; willing for all necessary sacrifice, but giving up nothing except as a needful holocaust to the great Cause. M. D. PETRE.

NAZARETH OR BETHLEHEM?

By CHARLES NYE, B.A., St. Peter's Hall, Oxford.

WAS Christ born in Nazareth or Bethlehem? This question is an important one, for if Christ was born in Nazareth then the Infancy Narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke must be classed, not as history, but as primitive Christian legend. With the advance of New Testament literary and historical criticism, doubts have been frequently cast on the traditional claim that Christ was born at Bethlehem. Thus Schmiedel writes:

'If we may venture upon any affirmation at all as to the place of the birth, it must be that it was at Nazareth.'¹

Cheyne and Usener also reject the tradition that Christ was born in Bethlehem.²

The fullest book in English on the subject is Sir William Ramsay's *Was Christ born in Bethlehem*. Ramsay has conveniently collected most of the relevant evidence, and, although his conclusion is contestable, his book is still the best foundation for a discussion of the problem. Since its publication in 1898, interest in the subject has declined in England. Several references to it, however, in Dr. J. Gresham Machen's recent book, *The Virgin Birth of Christ* (published in 1930), suggest that more attention has been given to it by American scholarship.

I.

Outside the Gospels of Matthew and Luke there is no statement in the New Testament that Christ was born in Bethlehem. In itself, this is not altogether surprising, for there are but few places where such information would be relevant. Although we must admit that the *argumentum e silentio* is often precarious, yet we would tentatively suggest that neither St. Paul nor the authors of the New Testament Epistles and the Apocalypse knew of *any* tradition concerning Christ's birth in Bethlehem.

In *Acts* no birth-story is mentioned. But this is not surprising, since the nature and scope of *Acts* would hardly allow for the insertion of a birth-tradition, and Luke had already written

¹ *Enc. Bib.*, Vol. III, Art. 'Mary.'

² cf. *Enc. Bib.*, Vol. III, Arts. 'Nazareth' and 'Nativity.'

an account of it in his Gospel. There is, however, in *Acts* one phrase (it occurs six times) which throws light on Christ's birth-place, namely, 'Jesus of Nazareth.' This may be compared with the primitive Jewish designation of His disciples in *Acts*—'The Nazarenes.' The Gospels of Mark and John also represent the tradition that Christ was known as 'Jesus of Nazareth.'³ And the official designation 'Jesus of Nazareth' over Christ's head on the Cross, in all four Gospels, carries great weight. In each of the three Synoptic Gospels, Christ's visit to Nazareth⁴ is described by them as a visit to His native place (*patris*), though Matthew, as Usener says, 'had no right (xiii, 54) to call Nazareth the native place (*πατρίδα*) of Christ as his predecessor (*Mk.* vi, 1) was able to do.'⁵ And Luke is guilty of the same inconsistency. All three Gospels in this account of the visit of Christ to Nazareth record that in the synagogue there He said the words 'A prophet is without honour in his native place.'

II.

We now turn to investigate the passages which expressly assert Christ's birth in Bethlehem. One of the most important is that which deals with the *enrolment* (*Luke* ii, 1-4):

'Now it came to pass in those days, there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus, that all the world should be enrolled. This was the first enrolment made when Quirinius was governor of Syria. And all went to enrol themselves, every one to his own city. And Joseph also went up from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth, into Judea, to the city of David, which is called Bethlehem, because he was of the house and family of David, to enrol himself with Mary, who was betrothed to him, being great with child.'

Ramsay comments as follows:

'The beautifully-told story of *Luke* i, ii, is an episode of family history of the most private character.'⁶

He contrasts this narrative with that of Matthew and suggests that whereas Matthew represents a *public* account of the birth and infancy, Luke represents a *private* account. This distinction is very subjective and difficult to maintain. Ramsay further suggests that the feelings of a woman, and more particularly of a mother, can be *sensed* in this Lucan account, and that Mary was the source—immediate or indirect—of *Luke* i, ii. But one of Luke's own characteristics is a sympathetic understanding of

³ e.g. *Mark* i, 24; *John* vii, 41f.

⁴ *Mark* vi, 1ff; *Mt.* xiii, 53ff; *Luke* iv, 16ff.

⁵ cf. *Enc. Bib.*, Vol. III, Art. 'Nativity.'

⁶ *op. cit.*, p. 74.

women. Moreover it would be strange if Mary concealed the story of the birth at Bethlehem until after the publication of Mark's Gospel (probably *c.* 65 A.D.), if indeed she was then alive, for she would then have been about 85 or 90 years of age. And it is not credible that Mark knew of the story and yet omitted it. It is therefore extremely improbable that Mary was the source of *Luke* i, ii.

The central presupposition of the Lucan account of the birth-story is the enrolment, and, in this connection, Ramsay adduces evidence for periodical enrolments in Egypt. They took place every fourteen years and are called *apographai* (ἀπογραφαί) which is the word used by Luke. Apparently they were instituted in 23 B.C., and for some of them the papyri provide evidence. It seems that enrolment-papers were filled in and sent to the Roman official by the heads of households; there is neither evidence nor suggestion that the people were required to go to specified centres. The phrase which occurs, ἀπογραφὴ κατ' οἰκίαν, only shows that the people were reckoned according to their families or households. In some parts of Egypt, moreover, annual valuations were apparently held in addition to the periodical enrolments. But all this evidence is relevant only to Egypt; it does not imply a system of universal enrolments, for which there seems to be no evidence until the references of Josephus⁷ to the great enrolment of 6-7 A.D. Moreover Josephus states that it was strange and unheard-of and caused much indignation, which seems definitely to reject the idea of a universal enrolment before A.D. 6 such as that to which *Luke* ii plainly refers: 'a decree from Caesar Augustus that all the world should be enrolled.' 'All the world' (πάσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην) clearly means the whole Roman Empire, *i.e.* the organized provinces together with dependent kingdoms. Palestine was at this time a dependency of Rome. On the death of Herod the Great in B.C. 4, it was Caesar who allotted Herod's kingdom to his three sons, Antipas and Philip becoming tetrarchs and Archelaus ethnarch of Judaea.

What evidence is there, then, for an enrolment in Palestine during the last few years B.C.? (a) In the first place, there is an inscription⁸ relating to the career of a certain Roman officer,

⁷ cf. Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, Book XVIII, ch. i.

⁸ cf. Ramsay, *op. cit.*, pp. 150ff.

Quintus Aemilius Secundus, who served under Quirinius, who himself is described as Caesar's legate in Syria (*legatus Caesaris Syriae*). Quirinius is said to have made a census of the population of Apameia, enumerating 117,000 citizens. Mommsen and other critics rejected this as a forgery, and the discovery at Venice of half of the long-lost stone on which it was engraved is hardly sufficient to make this evidence really trustworthy. In any case, it probably refers to the government of Syria by Quirinius in 6-7 A.D., for which we have reliable evidence.

(b) Again, Justin Martyr says that statistics of the periodic enrolments were preserved and could be consulted by anyone who distrusted Luke; they had only to read the registers drawn up by Quirinius. But this most probably refers to his government in 6 A.D. and the census referred to in *Acts* v, 37.

(c) Tertullian says that an enrolment was made by Sentius Saturninus, while governor of Syria during the years 9-7 B.C. We do not know the source of this information, however, and Tertullian probably ascertained who was governor for the period that he thought would coincide with Christ's birth.

There seems to be no convincing historical evidence for a universal enrolment or for a local enrolment in Palestine at the time of Christ's birth, if we put that birth in the proximity of 4 B.C. Nevertheless, if—in spite of the lack of evidence—there *was* a universal enrolment, or even a local enrolment in Palestine, there are several things that militate against the historicity of the Lucan account.

An enrolment in Palestine would not necessitate a visit to Bethlehem or any other city; the Roman method was that employed in Egypt, by which the head of each family filled up the enrolment-form and sent it in to the nearest Roman official. It has been suggested that the Jews would have been so annoyed by any Roman method, that Herod the Great, as a dependent king, conducted his enrolment in a tribal and Hebraic manner; the Jews, therefore, were not angered, and so Josephus does not mention it. But if such a method had proved successful in about 6 B.C., why was it not employed in 6 A.D.? This is not only incredible, but also contrary to the usual Roman efficiency. Ramsay asserts that 'owing to the care with which the Jews preserved their family records and pedigrees, all true Jews would know what was their family and their proper city according to

ancient tribal system.’⁹ Consequently the Jews would go to the cities proper to their tribe and family, whilst Gentiles, presumably, would be counted in the ordinary Roman way. Luke, however, says ‘*all* went to enrol themselves,’¹⁰ *not* ‘all Jews,’ and Luke, whose sympathies are pro-Gentile, is not likely to be thinking only of Jews in this case. Moreover, we have no reliable evidence that all the Jews knew their family-history, and the two variant genealogies of Christ¹¹ suggest that accurate details were *not* kept by Jewish families. And it is highly improbable that the Roman authorities would have sanctioned a method of enrolment so calculated to foment disturbance among a populace ever ready to revolt against the hated Roman power.

It is fairly certain that Quirinus was made governor of Syria in 6 A.D., when Judaea was incorporated in the province of Syria owing to the bad government and the banishment of Archelaus.¹² But it is very uncertain whether Quirinius had previously governed Syria or had been in Syria for any other purpose.

In 1764 A.D. there was found near Tivoli a fragment of marble which is now in the Lateran Museum of Christian Antiquities.¹³ On it is part of an inscription which records the career and honours of a Roman official, who has been thought to be Publius Sulpicius Quirinius. If this be correct, then he governed Syria before 6 A.D., and Mommsen thinks that the most probable date is 3-1 B.C. But Herod the Great died in 4 B.C. Accordingly, Ramsay suggests that *Luke* ii, 2 (‘when Quirinius was governor of Syria,’ R.V.) may only mean that Quirinius was an imperial legate *in* Syria, since Luke uses ἡγεμονεύειν, and it cognates widely. But this is not the *prima facie* meaning, and it is far more likely that the *governor* of the province should be mentioned than merely some imperial official in it. Besides, Matthew alone places Christ’s birth during Herod the Great’s life-time—and that in connection with the stories of the Magi, etc., which are peculiar to Matthew and would seem to be of doubtful historicity, and if known to Luke, unworthy of his inclusion.

Luke, then, was perhaps right in placing Christ’s birth during an earlier government of Syria by Quirinius after Herod’s

⁹ *op. cit.*, p. 188.

¹⁰ *Luke* ii, 3.

¹¹ *Mt.* i, 2ff and *Luke* iii, 23ff.

¹² cf. Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, Book XVIII, ch. i.

¹³ cf. Ramsay, *op. cit.*, pp. 227ff.

death, if Quirinius *did* govern Syria during the period B.C. 3—B.C. 1 as Mommsen suggests. But the details of an enrolment are probably due to confusion with the census of 6-7 A.D. Moreover, the Lucan account which represents the Holy Family as returning to Nazareth immediately after the Purification is plainly inconsistent with the narratives of the Visit of the Magi, the Massacre, and the Sojourn in Egypt as recorded by Matthew.

Matthew, for whom the record of the events of the life of Jesus Christ¹⁴ was in no small measure the fulfilment of a series of Old Testament predictions, places Christ's birth in Bethlehem as a fulfilment of the passage in *Micah V* (' But thou Bethlehem . . . '), just as he provides a fulfilment of *Hosea XI* (' I called my son out of Egypt ') by his narrative of the sojourn of the Holy Family there.

In view of these considerations, the tradition that Christ was born in Bethlehem can hardly claim to have substantial historical support.

III.

But if we reject the tradition that Christ was born in Bethlehem, then we must explain how it arose; and to this problem we must now turn our attention. The origin of this tradition is, we think, hinted at in such a passage as *John vii*, 41—' But some said, what, doth the Christ come out of Galilee? Hath not the scripture said that Christ cometh of the seed of David, and from Bethlehem, the city where David was?' or, again, in the alleged reply of the Sanhedrin¹⁵ to Herod's inquiry as to ' where the Christ should be born '—' in Bethlehem of Judaea.' For it seems evident that such passages as *Isaiah liii* were singularly appropriate to the life and especially the death of Christ,¹⁶ and that, when they became convinced that he was the Messiah, a search was made into the Old Testament and other Jewish literature for predictions of the Messiah. This search showed that the Messiah, among other conditions, should be born in Bethlehem.¹⁷ This notion undoubtedly arose from the statement in *I Samuel xvii*, 2, that David—traditionally the ideal king—was ' the son

¹⁴ cf. *Mt. i*, 22; *ii*, 15, 17, etc.

¹⁵ cf. *Mt. ii*, 4ff.

¹⁶ Whether Christ applied these passages to Himself, or regarded Himself as fulfilling them, is a more difficult problem.

¹⁷ *Micah v*, 2.

of the Ephrathite of Beth-lehem-judah, whose name was Jesse.' It is an interesting fact that a critical study of the narrative in I *Samuel* shows that David, like Christ, was probably not born in Bethlehem.

Now, it is significant that the only gospels that contain the Bethlehem-tradition are precisely those two—and we think, the only two—which contain statements in support of the Virgin Birth of Christ. We would suggest, therefore, that the extraordinarily long journey to Bethlehem and Christ's birth there were probably intended to explain the ignorance on the part of the people of Nazareth of Christ's miraculous conception and birth.¹⁸ The birth at Bethlehem was perhaps part of the same tradition that asserted the Virgin Birth. The validity of this suggestion will depend on our attitude towards the Virgin Birth. However, both the Bethlehem-tradition and the Virgin Birth are mentioned only in the Infancy-Narratives of Matthew and Luke. The variant reading in the Latin version (*b*) of *Luke* ii, 5, tends to confirm the suggestion of a connection between the two traditions; it substitutes ' . . . Mary, his wife,' for 'Mary, who was betrothed to him.' It shows, perhaps, that an original tradition¹⁹ of an ordinary conception and birth has been altered to suit the Virgin Birth, and then connected with the Bethlehem tradition to explain the ignorance of the people of Nazareth.

As a result, then, of our investigation of the evidence, we find ourselves compelled to conclude that Nazareth has greater claims to be the birthplace of Christ. But this is no isolated problem; with it is involved the whole question of the historicity of the Infancy Narratives and especially of the Virgin Birth. Such a conclusion will afflict us at the outset with a sense of loss. But on further reflection we find that the loss is more than balanced by the gain. As orthodox Christians, we hold the faith that in the Jesus of history we behold the deity unveiled to us under the limitations of humanity. If history deprives us of the primitive Christian setting of the birth of Christ, at least it gives us one whose humanity was identical with that of his human brethren.

¹⁸ cf. *Mark* vi, 1ff and parallels.

¹⁹ Represented by this reading of the Old Latin version (*b*).

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IN GREAT BRITAIN

A GOOD deal of interest and curiosity exists in the minds of many people as to the present position, and the prospects, of the Roman Catholic Church in this country. The propaganda of that Church is very active. Nevertheless, to the majority of English people the Roman Catholic Church is an institution whose services, and whose doctrinal system, are remote and strange. This article, by one who knows from personal experience, will attempt to give a brief account of what the 'Catholic life' actually is, and also what is the position of the Roman Catholic Church in Great Britain at the present time.

The writer was not a 'born Catholic' (that is, one coming of a Roman Catholic family), but was of Protestant Nonconformist ancestry. He received, however, only the vaguest theological teaching, and was seldom taken, in boyhood, to a church or chapel of any denomination. At school his closest friend was a Roman Catholic, whom he sometimes accompanied to his church when he went to confession. The lack of any positive close associations with any Church, together with the influence of an intimate friend, worked on a naturally religious temperament to create a bias in favour of the venerable and fascinating Roman Church. Even in boyhood the desire had arisen to belong to it. On leaving school, that desire was emphasized by a reaction from the strong anti-Christian propaganda which was going on at the beginning of this century. In the autumn of 1907 application was made to the then Prior (Dom Leo Almond) of the Benedictine Church at Ealing, London; and, after a course of instruction, reception into the Roman Catholic Church took place on December 17th of that year.

The Roman Catholic Church keeps exact statistics of the numbers of converts it receives every year, not only in the country as a whole, but in each diocese and parish. An intending convert has to be notified to the bishop, and cannot be received until the bishop has signified his consent after the local priest has satisfied himself that the neophyte is sufficiently instructed. The total of converts is about 11,000 annually. This seems a large

number : but of course it is less than one in 3,000 of the total population. Moreover, there are no statistics as to how many of these converts continue faithful. Probably a considerable number afterwards lapse. In any case, 'leakage' is a constant worry to the Roman Catholic clergy—it must be admitted, in this they but share the common lot of all denominations. One able writer (Rev. J. L. King, S.J., *A Way to End the Leakage*: Catholic Truth Society, 1930) says :

'There can be few Catholics indeed who have not heard of the Leakage Problem; we have grown all too familiar with the fact that the Church in this country suffers a large annual loss of those who give up the practice of their religion. But it is not generally realised that this leakage is perhaps the greatest problem which the Church has to face to-day—a problem on whose solution the whole well-being of Catholicism in this country depends.'

It has been estimated that the Roman Catholic Church has lost about a million adherents in England during the last ninety years, and that losses balance gains. Of course, exact figures are unobtainable.

The ceremony of reception into the Roman Catholic Church is impressive in its solemn simplicity. The neophyte kneels before the altar beside the priest, and, with his hand on a book of the Gospels, repeats this Profession of Faith :

'I [name], having before my eyes the Holy Gospels, which I touch with my hand, and knowing that no one can be saved without that faith which the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church holds, believes, and teaches; against which I grieve that I have greatly erred, inasmuch as, having been born outside that Church, I have held and believed doctrines opposed to her teaching: I now, enlightened by the grace of God, profess that I believe the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church to be the one true Church established on earth by Jesus Christ, to which *I submit myself with my whole heart*. I firmly believe all the articles that She proposes to my belief; I reject and condemn all that She rejects and condemns; and *I am ready to observe all that She commands me*. And especially I profess that I believe: One only God in three Divine Persons, distinct from and equal to each other—that is to say, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation, Passion, Death, and Resurrection, of our Lord Jesus Christ; the personal union of His two natures, the divine and the human; the divine maternity of the most holy Mary, together with her most spotless virginity and also her Immaculate Conception; the true, real, and substantial presence of the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, together with His soul and divinity, in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist; the seven Sacraments instituted by Jesus Christ for the salvation of mankind: that is to say, Baptism, Confirmation, Holy Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, Matrimony. I also believe in Purgatory, the resurrection of the dead, and everlasting life; the primacy, not of honour only, but also juris-

diction, of the Roman Pontiff, successor of St. Peter, prince of apostles, vicar of Jesus Christ; the veneration of the saints and of their images; the authority of apostolic and ecclesiastical traditions, and of the Holy Scriptures, which we must interpret and understand only in the sense which our holy mother the Catholic Church has held and does hold: to whom alone it belongs to judge of their meaning and interpretation; *and everything else that has been defined and declared by the Sacred Canons and by the Ecumenical Councils*—especially by the holy Council of Trent and the Council of the Vatican. With a sincere heart, therefore, and with unfeigned faith, I detest and abjure every error, heresy and sect opposed to the said Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman Church. So help me God and these His Holy Gospels, which I touch with my hand.'

I have italicised some passages in this formidable declaration. Theoretically, Roman Catholic theology distinguishes between what is *de fide* and what is not: what is infallible truth and what is matter of opinion. The above italicised clauses, however, obscure that distinction, and commit the convert into a submission too great even on the Roman Church's own principles.

If the neophyte has been validly baptised before, and the fact is known for certain, the Profession of Faith completes the reception. If he or she certainly never has been baptised, baptism follows. If there is a doubt, baptism is given 'conditionally.'

The reception having been completed, the convert enters upon the fulness of 'the Catholic life': and it is unique and fascinating.

Around, all the time, is that impalpable but very real thing, 'the Catholic atmosphere.' To the devout Roman Catholics the spiritual world is no mere theoretic abstraction, but a reality with which they are in constant touch. In the Holy Communion they believe they really and literally receive the God-Man. They believe that when they go to confession they receive from the priest supernatural forgiveness of their sins. In indulgences they believe they can gain remission of purgatorial punishment. Then, again, they believe that the saints are always looking down on them from heaven and that those saints, and the Blessed Virgin, intercede with God for them and can obtain for them spiritual and even temporal favours. (The pages of Roman Catholic periodicals constantly contain 'thanksgivings for favours received' from the saints and the Virgin.) Roman Catholics are entirely opposed to Spiritualists, but in a certain way they are not dissimilar, as their minds are saturated with the belief in a supernatural world around them, constantly active.

(Some, of course, are more receptive than others.) Turning over, quite at random, the pages of a popular Roman Catholic periodical, the following 'Petitions' are seen :

'*Manchester*; W.R. asks prayers for preservation of nephew's sight, and promises Mass. *Putney*; M.M. asks prayers for success in examination; promises Mass and publication . . . *Manchester*; M.B. asks prayers for a good change in business; promises Mass and publication.' Under 'Thanksgivings' these are seen:—'*Warrington*; *Rex*: Thanks for recovery through Our Lady after promise of publication. . . . *Hull*: Thanks to Our Lady of Perpetual Succour for success in examination. . . . *A.M.D.G.* offers Mass for success in examination after promise. . . . *Mark Cross*: Thanks for three special favours through Our Lady . . . *Bowdon*; *K.M.G.* returns thanks and offers Mass for great favours through Our Lady, St. Joseph, and St. Anthony after promise of Mass and publication, and asks prayers for three big intentions, and promises Mass and publication.'

The above are quoted not in any spirit of ridicule. To those who have never experienced the 'Catholic atmosphere,' they will sound strange; but the explanation is to be found in the Catholic atmosphere which assumes the spiritual world of God, and of the saints, to be a positive reality, with which the faithful may be in constant touch. 'Into what a supernatural state it [prayer] throws a man! He lives in a different world from other men. Different dwellers are round about him, and are his familiars: God, Jesus, Mary, Angels, and Saints' (the late Father F. W. Faber, *Growth in Holiness*, p. 258). As has been remarked, not all Roman Catholics are equally susceptible to these influences; some are very devout, others less, others even indifferent—for no two men or women are alike: but the spirit itself of the religion is as described. It is no mere governmental system, or code of abstract dogma; but a living mystical reality.

Every parish has its guilds, two in particular: the Guild of the Blessed Sacrament, for men (this takes precedence over all others), and the Children of Mary, for girls and young women. Frequent or even daily Holy Communion is encouraged. There are frequent Processions of the Host, or of the Blessed Virgin, in the churches. Then the devotion of the Forty Hours (*Quarant' Ore*) is very popular—a large Host, in a monstrance, is placed on the altar, and surrounded by many lighted candles. It is kept there for forty hours for adoration, and the people constantly enter the church for silent worship, certain of them taking turns as 'watchers.' (When properly carried out, the *Quarant' Ore* is continuous throughout the night.)

What is the present position of the Roman Catholic Church in Great Britain? From 1559 till 1829 it had lain under drastic penal laws. The Emancipation Act of 1829 removed almost all those statutes; but Roman Catholics were few and uninfluential.

‘In England the Roman Catholics were a small remnant, grouped for the most part around certain old families who provided chapels in their own mansions for the very few Catholics of the neighbourhood’ (Denis Gwynn, *The Struggle for Catholic Emancipation*; London, 1928; p. 3).

The Irish Famine of the eighteen-forties swelled their numbers, when many hundreds of immigrants flocked hither from destitution in Erin; but of course they were in the depths of poverty. From the pence of these poor newcomers, humble chapels (the word ‘church’ was seldom used in this connection then) arose; and the result was that the nascent Roman Catholic Church in England developed as a mainly urban, Irish body as to the majority of its members, while the minority, old ‘English Catholics,’ with a few aristocratic lay leaders, stood apart from the Irish majority in racial and class antagonism. The Roman Catholic Church in England became a body divided within itself; and that antagonism was to continue till the Irish Treaty of 1921.

When the Oxford Movement in the Church of England had started in 1832, Dr. (afterwards to be Cardinal-Archbishop) Wiseman—then the leading Roman Catholic apologist here—entertained high hopes that it would lead to a mass-conversion of Anglicans to Rome. Little did he dream what was to be the actual course of events: a few years later the sudden influx of Roman Catholics from Ireland, building up, with ‘the pence of the poor,’ a Church whose internal divisions would hinder that proselytizing activity for eighty years.

In 1850 came the ‘Papal Aggression,’ as it was then popularly called: the setting up in England and Wales, by Pope Pius IX, of a hierarchy of bishops with territorial titles headed by Dr. (simultaneously made Cardinal) Wiseman as Archbishop of Westminster. Looking back on that event after many years, we are inclined to smile at the panic then aroused; but in fairness we should recognize that the Pope’s Bull was based on the assumption that England and Wales were a land devoid of a Christian Church validly organized: *i.e.* the Bull was an attack

on the religious position of most Englishmen and on some important principles of the Constitution. However, the fewness and weakness of Roman Catholics here made it a theoretical rather than a practical attack. Cardinal Wiseman and his colleagues had their hands full in constructing, from the foundations, a Church recently emerged 'from the Catacombs.' His successor, the famous Henry Edward Manning, was involved, throughout his episcopate, with the Irish-English, the Ultramontane-Cisalpine, and other controversies; but found time to take an active share in British economic problems. Herbert Vaughan (1892—1903) founded the Cathedral at Westminster, and devoted himself especially to the establishment of Roman Catholic elementary schools. The present Archbishop of Westminster, Cardinal Francis Bourne (translated from the see of Southwark, 1903), deals with a situation very different from that of his predecessors.

What has been the result of 102 years' endeavour? It has been a steady process of increasingly-efficient organization, hampered, however, as already mentioned, during most of the time by the now only recently-ceased antagonisms of the Irish majority-section and the English minority.

The various Religious Orders of monks, friars, and nuns, nearly all have branches in England: Augustinians, Benedictines, Canons Regular of the Lateran, Carmelites, Carthusians, Dominicans, Jesuits, Oblates of Mary, Franciscans, Passionists, Premonstratensians, Redemptorists, Salesians, Servites. Convent-schools are numerous, and attract many 'non-Catholic' pupils. The Dominicans, Benedictines, Redemptorists, and Jesuits, do considerable propaganda and parochial work, in addition to maintaining schools. The Jesuits (as befits the tradition of their Institute) are in the vanguard of controversy. Their magazine, *The Month*, is an arsenal of polemics.

The Catholic Truth Society was founded in 1884 through pressure brought to bear on Bishop (afterwards Archbishop and Cardinal) Vaughan by some zealous laymen, of whom the late Mr. James Britten was the leader. Its object was to publish cheap booklets in defence of the Roman position; and there can be no doubt of its considerable effectiveness. Since the Great War it has been reorganized on a broader basis.

The Guild of Our Lady of Ransom for the Conversion of England ('Guild of Ransom') was founded by the Rev. Philip Fletcher, a convert from Anglo-Catholicism, in 1887, its main work being the organizing of those outdoor processions which, when it began them, were regarded as startling by the public, but which have become, since then, a regular feature of most districts having any considerable number of Roman Catholics.

The Catholic Missionary Society is a community of secular clergy at Brondesbury, London, who, under the presidency of the Rev. Herbert Vaughan (a nephew of the late Cardinal), give lectures in all parts of the country in advocacy of the Roman faith. The Catholic Evidence Guild (founded in 1918) does somewhat similar work, but confines itself to public parks, street-corners, etc., and its speakers are mainly laymen and laywomen. Each has to hold a 'speaker's licence' from a bishop. The Catholic Reading Guild is a comparatively small body, having for its motto 'the conversion of England by books.' Its work is purely that of a library, but its secretary, Mr. G. E. J. Coldwell, is an able public speaker.

The conversion of Jews to Roman Catholicism is another form of propagandist effort, the agency engaged in it being the Catholic Guild of Israel, Bayswater, London. As to actual result, few Jews are converted, and the Guild is perforce restricted mainly to promoting conciliation between them and Roman Catholics.

The Westminster Catholic Federation was founded in 1905 by Mr. W. P. Mara, a layman, to organize Roman Catholic resistance to threatened amendments of the Education Acts. The Federation has since engaged in various other forms of activity. When I was on its Vigilance Committee we took up (1923—1924) the subject of statements, objectionable to Roman Catholics, which are found in history-books used in London County Council elementary schools. There was (probably is) some foundation for complaints in this matter; but the proper method to obtain redress would be to make public the grievances and claim remedy. This I conceived to be the intention; but eventually a policy was insisted on of confidential approaches to publishers to alter their books under the Federation's oversight. When we remember that the institutions to be affected by this process were

the schools of the general ('non-Catholic') public, and that that public was to be kept in ignorance of what was afoot—then it may be understood why, after resisting as long as possible that secret process, I resigned and wrote in the press repudiating it. Apart from such matters as this, however, I recognize the beneficent nature of much of the Federation's work * (*see F.N.*).

The Catholic Social Guild is a small body studying economic problems according to the teaching of the encyclicals of Leo XIII. It has established, with some degree of association with Oxford University, a Catholic Workers' College for training selected students in those subjects.

The Society of St. John Chrysostom is a recently-formed body having for its aim the study of the Eastern Churches.

The Catenian Association (*catena*, a chain) is an association of business and professional men for mutual benefit; it excludes the clergy from its membership. The Knights of St. Columba (modelled on the American 'Knights of Columbus') is somewhat similar, but is open to all classes and to clerics.

The Roman Catholic Church in Great Britain is very well served by its periodical press. The sixpenny weekly review-newspaper, *The Tablet*, disclaims being 'official,' but it is part-owned by Cardinal Bourne and is generally accepted as semi-official. *The Catholic Times* and *The Catholic Herald* have considerable influence as twopenny weeklies; but, of that type of paper, the one which of late years has shown the most remarkable progress is *The Universe*. Previous to the war it was insignificant; at one time it was partly written in Irish Gaelic!—but, after the war, a new proprietorship infused new life into it, and it is now the most widely-read Roman Catholic newspaper. There are also numerous monthly organs of a devotional or literary type.

On May 2, 1869, the Roman Catholic bishops in England, by a solemn resolution, ordered that 'public as well as private prayers and intercessions be offered up constantly to God for the conversion of England,' and that 'the exposition and benediction of the Blessed Sacrament on the second Sunday of every month shall be for this intention.' Cardinal Wiseman had composed, a few years before, a special prayer and litany in view of that intention, beseeching God, through 'the intercession of Thy saints,' to cause this nation to be 'restored to that unity of mind,

steadiness of faith, and peace of conscience, which are nowhere to be found but in the communion of Thy Church.' For over sixty years this stream of prayer has gone up, accompanied by incessant practical efforts: but the victory seems as far off as ever.

The mistake of the Roman Church is in making too high claims for itself. After experiencing the riches of its devotional life, the present writer realized that fact, and left it in 1926. It is a great Church, but is too wedded to old and disproved theories and oppressive disciplines.

J. W. POYNTER.

* Since the above article was written, Cardinal Bourne (see *The Catholic Times*, November 27, 1931) has made a speech defending the Catholic Federation's action as to the history-books. With all respect to his Eminence, I cannot but think he misses the point. No one accuses the members of the Federation of personally dishonourable conduct. Nor does anyone say that Roman Catholics have no right to protest against what they think unfair to them. What was and is challenged is the right of a sectarian body to try to alter books of publicly-owned schools without the knowledge of the public. Such a process is the very way to produce 'distorted history' in such books. Will the Federation publish, for general circulation, the volume containing all the changes it proposed? The public surely has a right to know the details.

THE FRIARS IN THE REIGN OF HENRY III

NOTHING in the later Middle Ages is more pathetic than the disappointment experienced by the people in their most cherished institutions. The Papacy, for which there was an instinctive reverence, became associated in the public mind with incessant litigation and unceasing calls for money. The bishops usually owed their position to court favour and were immersed in secular business, to the spiritual detriment of their diocese. Many of the parochial clergy were pluralists or minors and unable to discharge their duties to their flocks. Some of the priests lived in open concubinage, others were secretly married and, in either case, outraged canon law and public sentiment. The monastic bodies were absorbed in their worldly affairs; though not in the world, they were of it, and took little or no account of the aspirations of those under their jurisdiction.

Such was the state of things in England at the dawn of the thirteenth century. Then, suddenly, like a light from heaven,

the Dominican and Franciscan friars appeared. They were pledged to an apostolic simplicity of life. Unlike the young ruler of the Gospel, they had been obedient to the divine call, even at the cost of all their possessions. They were ready not only to spend their strength in the service of others, but to show their love by dying for them. They sought neither fame, nor riches, nor honour, but were content to beg their daily bread. The very name of the first settlement of the Franciscans or Minorities, in London, in 1224, 'Stinking Lane, near the Shambles,' indicates that they meant to preach the Gospel to the poorest and the most degraded. We find some of them a little later at Salisbury drinking the dregs of beer 'with great joy and mirth round a fire in the kitchen at the time of dinner.'

The earlier Franciscans, then, usually selected for their settlement the worst and lowest parts of a town, where fevers and leprosy ran riot among a population sunk in misery and squalor. The low and cheap buildings which they erected in such places were no way better than those of their poverty-stricken neighbours. Those who saw them in their coarse clothes tramping without shoes in the mud or in the snow, and frequently leaving tracks of blood as they passed along, took knowledge of them that they were not as others.

The two great mendicant orders were efficiently organized. The Dominicans were controlled by a Master General, resident at Rome, who was advised by a council representing the eight provinces of the order. The Franciscans, governed by the rules of St. Francis himself, who died in 1226, were in like manner subject to a Minister General with a Council composed of Provincial Ministers. Subject to the Provincial Ministers were the seven Warders. They resided in the great centres of London, York, Oxford, Cambridge, Bristol, Newcastle and Worcester, and seem to have exercised jurisdictional powers over the neighbouring districts. Each Wardenship had from seven to nine Convents under its control. The Provincial Minister was the supreme power in the country. The residence of the chief Ministers of the two orders at Rome was the main cause of their subjection and unquestioning obedience to the Pope. The ill-effects of this vassalage will be seen later.

The Friars lost no time in entering the Universities; there they became their most eminent, though perhaps not their most

popular, members. Lecturers, who not only taught, but heard and answered questions, were enlisted from the ranks of the Friars. Adam Marsh was an eminent Franciscan lecturer at Oxford. Thirty other lecturers of the Order, all members of the University, were placed in as many towns throughout the country. To these centres flocked the brothers from neighbouring Friaries and counted not the pains of the journey. Villagers beheld them trudging bravely over roads knee-deep in mud, or choked with dust, sustained by the fire of the spirit within them, and gladly helped them on their way. These student friars in their sermons to the people reproduced in a simpler form what they had heard, and thus the bright beams of light were diffused throughout the country. Men of the highest rank joined the orders. Gifts of land and buildings were constantly forthcoming. Property was given or bequeathed on trust for their benefit. Thus, though the Friars were mendicants and begged their bread, they had not been long in the country before their wants were often anticipated. We have now seen something of the character of the earlier Friars and of the ennobling sentiments which animated the movement. The response of the people was immediate and more than generous. Within little more than a generation from the commencement of the mission of the orders and the building of their first lowly dwellings, men were astonished at the amplitude of the resources at their command. Some of their houses are described as sumptuous and magnificent. So vast was the Dominican Friary at Oxford in 1258 that it was chosen as the meeting-place of the great assembly commonly known as the Oxford Parliament. Considerably before that date, friars were moving in the courts of kings and in fashionable society. Some of them were ambassadors, others Royal councillors, others Papal treasurers or executants. Most of them no doubt still preached the Gospel to the poor, but there was a growing number who did not disdain to 'tickle the ears of the groundlings' with biting satire, or charm them with flattering words. Many friars were travellers and men of the world who had been to Rome more than once, or moved among the Crusaders, or even been so far as Russia or Tartary. Some, doubtless, as in Chaucer's days, were musicians, and to the harp could tune their merry note, while their eyes sparkled with fun and fancy. Others again had become physicians, or students of

natural science, or prided themselves on an acquaintance with a portion of Aristotle's works. Men such as these were welcome guests in the houses of the great whom they could charm with what was fresh and delightful.

They were not quite so much at home in sordid surroundings. Almost from the inception of their mission there were influences at work which ran counter to the primitive self-abnegation of the two great orders. Among such causes of spiritual deterioration, was the employment of the Friars on missions in which the collection of money bore the principal part. When we remember that it was the rule of the Franciscans only to touch money with a stick, we see how contrary to the spirit of their order were missions such as these. It was the Dominican and Franciscan Friars who, as early as 1235, and on many subsequent occasions, bearing the full authority of the Pope, were pre-eminent in enlisting men for the Crusades and signing each Crusader with the Cross. They also for a pecuniary consideration absolved from their Crusading vow those who were unable or unwilling to carry it into execution, but had been induced to take it by the Indulgence promised by the Pope to everyone who volunteered.

It should be noted that the attractive force of the Papal Indulgence which was obtained by those who volunteered for the Crusades, was far greater than can now be conceived. For, while episcopal indulgences granted only the remission of penances enjoined in the Confessional, 'Papal indulgences relieved the privileged penitents for definite periods from the purgatorial fires.' Such indulgences were by no means despised by the many who believed in a physical purgatory and in the Pope's power of remission. Thus it came to pass that Papal indulgences drew money from the pockets of those who could little afford it in days when means were so scanty and fleecings so constant. When the enthusiasm of these solemn days was over and reflection followed, the more sceptical spirits made anxious inquiries concerning the ultimate destination of the large sums thus collected throughout the country. They ventured even to describe such ceremonies as 'impudent Roman devices for filching the resources of the community.'

Gregory IX, the Pope in whose reign the events described took place, and to whom much of the money thus raised is believed to have gone, is remarkable as the Pontiff who, though

an octogenarian when he was raised to the Papal chair, surprised the faithful by reigning for fourteen years and living to be almost a centenarian. He is also famous as the Pope in whose days the Eastern was sundered from the Western Church. His almost unceasing war with the Emperor Frederick drained the resources of his See and compelled him to cast his net on every side of the ship. Only too often the Dominicans and Franciscans were his fishers of money.

Gregory's successor, Innocent IV, continued the war with the Emperor and added to his commitments his support of the falling Latin Empire of Constantinople. Situated as he was with immense expenses and a bankrupt exchequer, the Pope was driven to unceasing and increasing raids on the pockets of his subjects. His agents gave him some private information which he resolved to turn to good account. Three English priests, they said, had recently died intestate, and, for their condition in life, were possessed of wealth 'beyond the dreams of avarice.' The Pope took the hint and caused a decree to be published in England that the property of 'intestate' clerks should fall to himself. He entrusted to the Franciscan friars the unpleasant task of gathering this wheat into his garner. So outrageous was this demand, that Henry III broke away for once from his usual subservience to the Papacy and issued a prohibition forbidding obedience to the decree. Moreover, the outcry was so vehement against an ordinance which, if executed, would have impoverished many families, that the Cardinals themselves compelled the Pope to revoke it. In the same year, 1246, Innocent issued fresh instructions to the Provincial Minister of the Franciscan friars in England. They and the Dominicans were to be ordered to confiscate the property of usurers who were still living and devote it to the relief of Constantinople. They were to absolve from their sins all who enlisted for this service or who gave an adequate subscription. The friars were to seize the wrongful gains of deceased persons who had cheated others. Yet they were not to devote them to making restitution to those who had been robbed, but to the Papal service. It was quite usual in those days to bequeath money to 'pious uses'; at the same time the testator made it the duty of his executors to choose the special objects to which this bequest to 'pious uses' should be applied. Under the Papal orders, the friars were to regard

the Pope's service as 'the pious uses' and to seize the legacy for his benefit.

Moreover, it was ordered that property which men still living had acquired by cheating should be devoted to the Pope's service, unless the victims of their frauds could be found. It would be impossible to conceive tasks more abhorrent to high-minded men, more contrary to the letter and the spirit of their orders, more inquisitorial and more likely to make the Dominicans and Franciscans 'a proverb and a by-word' with the people than those thus enjoined by the Pope.

In 1247, two Franciscan friars were appointed by the Pope to obtain money for his needs. They arrived in England, we are told, armed with Papal bulls, and interviewed King Henry, who was charmed with their lowly appearance and the winning courtesy of their manners. They hoped, they said, that the King would not consider that they were making an unreasonable request. All they asked was permission to seek charitable aid for their Master, the Pope. There would be no coercion of any kind. Those whom they visited would have only their own feelings and consciences to consider. They could give or they could refuse. The King's leave was promptly obtained, and his 'clerks' were lavish in their presents to the insinuating strangers. The friars doffed their coarse vesture and donned clothes of the best quality and the latest cut before they left the Court. Thus arrayed, they started on their mission, mounted on palfreys with gilded housings and wearing knightly boots and spurs. They soon showed themselves in their true colours. They began their work with the higher religious and secular clergy. They did not beg, they did not ask. Such methods were quite beneath their pretensions. On the contrary, after ostentatiously showing to Abbot or Bishop the Papal bulls which gave them their authority, they demanded a large sum of money, the amount of which they themselves fixed. Their manner was no longer courteous, it was not even civil, but determined and even menacing. They called at the Bishop of Lincoln's Inn and asked to see Grosseteste, that famous bishop and scholar, who possessed a European reputation for his virtues. The Bishop surveyed his visitors with amazement and found it almost impossible to believe that the fashionable gentlemen whom he saw before him were really friars. They soon proved the authenticity of their mission by

displaying the Papal bulls. They then proceeded to an urgent demand of six thousand marks from the revenues of the Bishop's see—an amount probably equal to two or three years' income. Grosseteste was at first almost speechless with astonishment at such unparalleled greed. When, to some extent, he had recovered his equanimity, he informed the friars that their demand was unexampled and dishonourable, dishonourable because impossible to fulfil. Moreover, he added, it concerned not only himself, but the clergy and people, and indeed the whole community. He could therefore give no reply until he had obtained the advice of the great council of the nation, which was directly concerned in such matters. The friars, apparently, impudent as they were, hesitated to insult or abuse a personage of Grosseteste's distinction and quietly withdrew with their work unaccomplished.

Having obtained both more and less from Grosseteste than they had expected, they mounted their horses and rode off to the great Abbey of St. Albans in the hope of better fortune with the Abbot. On their arrival, they declined to lodge in a guest-house which had been recently erected and was specially designed for the use both of Dominicans and Franciscans. That house they considered unworthy of men of their distinction. The authorities of the Abbey took them at their own valuation, and they were 'reverently received' in a finer guest-house frequented by the Bishop of the Diocese and others of high rank. In their interview with the Abbot, they demanded four hundred marks for the service of the Pope under heavy penalties for non-compliance. Further, they informed the Abbot that the money must be promptly paid. The two friars found a man as cautious as Grosseteste in the Abbot, and they received from him a similar answer. Once more they mounted their horses; but they rode off sullenly and were heard muttering threats in the distance.

Missions such as these which have been described had the effect of turning the friars who took part in them into the most worldly of men, and made the two orders unpopular with the episcopate and with the monastic bodies. There were other causes which were constantly producing these and worse effects, and tending to neutralize the efforts of those brethren who remained true to the principles on which the orders were founded.

In 1227, Gregory IX had written a letter to the Primate and other dignitaries bidding them welcome the Dominicans kindly, arrange for their support and allow them full liberty of preaching, of hearing confessions and of enjoining penances. Innocent IV confirmed these privileges. Puffed up by these and other Papal favours, the Dominicans went to ecclesiastical synods and demanded liberty of preaching where they pleased, whether before synods or in the parish churches. They also questioned individuals whom they met. 'Have you confessed?' 'Yes,' was the usual reply. 'To whom?' 'To my parish priest.' 'And who is that idiot? He knows nothing of theology, has never toiled over the decrees nor learnt to solve a single problem. Blind they are and leaders of the blind. Come to us who know a hawk from a handsaw. Come to us to whom the divine secrets are open. You may with confidence confess to us, to whom, as you see and hear, so great powers have been committed.'

The result of Papal support and of the preaching and representations of the friars was that the parish priests were looked upon with contempt and the ancient order completely dislocated. As has been truly said, 'The immunities of the Mendicants carried confusion into every house and into every parish. Their privilege of preaching, of hearing confessions, of absolution, of administering the sacraments, of giving burial, emptied the churches, the confessionals and the pockets of the parochial clergy.' Parishioners, and especially 'nobles' and the wives of 'nobles,' no longer came to their priests to confess, receive their penances and be shriven. The check of the Confessional had often made men hesitate to commit sins which they would blush to confess to the priest whom they met almost daily. That check was virtually gone. 'Let us follow,' men said, 'the lust of our own hearts. How easy, when we have enjoyed what we desired, to confess to one of the Dominicans or Franciscans, a bird of passage whom we shall never see again!' Thus it came to pass that the parish priests were derided and 'sin abounded.'

Armed with multiform powers by the Pope, and backed as they were by the King and by the 'nobles,' the friars made things as unpleasant for the monks as for the parish priests. Certain Dominicans, for example, went to St. Albans Abbey, when a synod was being held in the church under the presidency of the

Archdeacon of the Abbey. The friars entered the church, interrupted the proceedings and exhibited their credentials, which gave them new and unprecedented powers. One of their number imperiously demanded silence, as he meant to preach. But the Archdeacon, a man of sense and character, begged him to stay a little. On what grounds, he wished to know, did he regard the monks as unfit to discharge their appointed duty? Was salvation limited to the friars? It was true that the Dominicans were called 'preachers,' but preaching was not their only function. It was notorious that they devoted themselves so earnestly to receiving, or rather to extorting confessions, that they really ought to receive the additional title of 'Friars Confessors.' 'By no means will I permit you,' continued the Archdeacon, 'either to preach, or to hear the confessions of those over whom I am set by the Abbot's command.'

The Archdeacon then opened a book and read a decree of the Lateran Council held under Innocent III, in 1215. The decree ordered that everyone should confess at least once a year to his own parish priest and to no other without the permission of that priest. It is interesting to note that it was ordained by that decree that any priest who presumed to reveal sin laid open in the Confessional should not only be deposed from the priesthood, but also be despatched to a strict monastery and condemned to a life-long penance. As far as we know, the Archdeacon defeated the machinations of the friars. As a rule, however, a Papal bull conveying a special privilege contained a 'non obstante' clause which set aside decrees conflicting with it. The difficulties connected with preaching and hearing confessions by the friars became so acute that the bishops in days rather later adopted a system of licensing them annually for these purposes. In some cases powers were even given to a particular friar 'to hear the confessions of any of our subjects,' so that the rights of the parish priests were still to some extent invaded. Yet, as only a limited number of such licenses were issued, and as, moreover, they were annual and could be withdrawn in case of abuse, incumbents suffered less than in the time of Henry III.

The greatest vexation inflicted by the friars on the monastic bodies was their intrusion upon their lands. Many towns in

England were subject to the sway of great Abbeys or Priors, which often owned most of the adjacent land. The friars were anxious to have a permanent settlement in such places; a 'consummation' not 'devoutly wished' by the monks, who regarded the friars as interlopers. But the latter represented to the convents that they could not carry out the sacramental and other duties of a mission in which they were engaged without the loan of 'a parcel of ground.' They urged that they would occupy it perhaps only for a day and a night—at all events but for a very short time. The monks could not refuse a request apparently so innocent and so reasonable without incurring public odium, and the petition was granted. But these unbidden guests, the friars, when they once came, often came to stay. Pleading illness or some other excuse, they remained and it was impossible to dislodge them. They brought with them a consecrated stone altar and placed it on an altar of wood which they hastily constructed. They then celebrated secret masses in a low tone and received the confessions of those living in the neighbourhood, to the prejudice of the parish priest. They made their customary declaration to penitents in need of their services that they had received the power of hearing confessions and of giving absolution from the Pope himself. And what an opportunity, what an 'accepted time' sinners now had! Why confess again to a man who perhaps loved his glass and was no whit better than themselves! Let them turn their back on him and henceforth come to the friars and receive the spiritual benefits which they had to offer.

While the intruding friars adopted every subterfuge to protract their stay, they sent a proctor in hot haste to Rome. The proctor was instructed to demand a Papal order against the convent for the bestowal of a house and land on the friars. If this unwilling offering were not to their taste, they were loud in their abuse of the monks and threatened litigation against them until they had exhausted all their resources. The monks knew their influence with the Pope and usually gave way, even though their income suffered and they had enemies at their gates. Sometimes, however, their intrusions and requests were so impudent that Gregory IX on one occasion expressed his disgust and brought about a temporary abatement of the evil.

It fortuned at times that the friars were violently intruded into the monasteries by powerful laymen. Thus the Earl of Gloucester and Gilbert de Preston invaded the territory of the great Abbey of St. Edmund, at Bury, on behalf of the Franciscans. The Abbot had undergone the expense and trouble of a journey to Rome and had returned in triumph with a Papal letter protecting his convent from the anticipated intrusion. But the friars were more than his match. He was very soon confronted with a Papal order of a slightly later date and of precisely opposite tenor, and was now helpless. Stately buildings soon arose which provoked the wonder of beholders. For indeed they found it impossible to reconcile this display with the poverty professed by the lowly followers of St. Francis.

The Dominicans were equally progressive at Dunstable. Relying on their privileges and on the support of Cardinal Hugo, an influential member of the Sacred College, they set up an altar without permission from the Priory and said Mass before it. They enlarged their buildings from day to day and appropriated more and more of the monastic land. The rents and oblations due to the convent diminished, so that this intrusion of the Dominicans is pronounced to have been an 'enormous injury' to the Priory of Dunstable.

The craze for fine buildings is said to have exercised a demoralizing influence on members of the orders. We are told by Thomas of Eccleston of a certain Franciscan, William of Abingdon, that before he devoted himself to the extension of the Friary at Gloucester, a proceeding involving constant appeals for funds, he was remarkable for his gifts as a preacher. He was reproved by the visitor of his order for prostituting his talents. Indeed he became so incorrigible a beggar, that King Henry said to him, 'Brother William, you used to speak so spiritually and now all you say is "Give, give."'

Grosseteste, the jewel of his age, is a witness to the early corruption of many of the friars. He was attended in the last days of his life by a physician belonging to the Dominican order, who was also a reader in theology and a cultivated scholar. In conversing with him, Grosseteste charged both the Dominicans and Franciscans with heresy in not opposing the vices of the rich. That same guilt they also incurred in not resisting the

scandalous clerical appointments of the Pope. Two days before his death the Bishop summoned several of his chaplains to his bedside. His physical powers were then fast ebbing away, but the strength and fire of his spirit were unabated. He spoke at length of the abuses which paralysed the spiritual work of the Church and especially of the 'loss of souls' through the avarice of the Papal Court. He charged the two orders, acting under Papal authority, with wresting bequests for the Crusades from those who were at the point of death. He declared that he had seen a Papal indulgence graduating the length of remission from the pains of purgatory according to the amount of a legacy. He said that even friars of holy life and great learning were appointed as Papal collectors, to the debasement of their characters. At the end of his 'prophetic' discourse, which embraced much more than has been stated, and which was broken with sighs, sobs and tears, the sands of Grosseteste's little remaining strength ran out. As Walton says of as great a man, 'His spirits failed him, and after a short conflict between nature and death, a quiet sigh put a period to his last breath and so he fell asleep.'

The phenomenal growth of the power and position of the Dominican order may be gathered from an account of a meeting of the General Chapter in their house at Holborn in 1250. Four hundred brothers were present at this meeting and came from all parts of the Christian world, some of them even from the Holy Land. King, nobles, abbots, and London citizens vied with one another in their hospitality. King Henry himself entered the chapter-house to beg the prayers of the assembled friars. He entertained them at dinner on the day of his visit, 'to have the honour of feasting with them.'

We may judge from the facts on record that the friars, even so early as the reign of Henry III, were not an unmixed blessing to the country. Among them, as we well know, were men of unspotted lives and of stainless honour—there were famous scholars, there were scientists of the first distinction. So also there were many brothers whose only care it was to be doing good to those living in sin, in poverty, and in disease. But men such as these were radiant stars in a firmament cloaked in clouds and darkness. The stars grew less, the darkness increased, until the friars were swept away, 'unwept, unhonoured, and unsung.'

H. P. PALMER.

PROTESTANTISM IN FRANCE

By the Rev. C. H. D. GRIMES, M.A., F.R.G.S., British Chaplain,
Bordeaux.

SOME time ago an eminent ecclesiastic who has devoted much study to the question of Reunion of the Churches gave a lecture on Protestantism in Europe. When he sat down I remarked to him that he had said nothing about Protestantism in France. He said the reason for that was a very good one, namely, that he knew nothing about it.

I had myself lived for some years in France before I began to know anything about the position of Protestantism here, and I have talked with many well educated and *fidèle* Protestants who seem to be able to give me very little information.

The obvious reason for this is that Protestantism is numerically weak and suffers much from internal divisions. Even if we include Alsace and Lorraine, it barely numbers a million adherents, and if we exclude these provinces its numbers are estimated between six and eight hundred thousand—about one-fortieth of the population of France. It occupies only about one-twentieth of the soil of France. If we exclude Paris and Lyons, Protestantism is concentrated in some nine departments, or rather in nine electoral districts situated in these departments, namely, in Poitou, Saintonge, Le Tarn, Le Gard, La Lozère, La Haute Loire, l'Ardèche, La Drôme and Le Doubs. It is found also in Normandie, La Dordogne, Lorraine and La Bearn, and more recently in Pas-de-Calais and du Nord. French Protestantism looks to Calvin and Geneva for its inspiration, and this is not unnatural seeing that Calvin was a Frenchman who had studied law and possessed the legal type of mind which is a leading French characteristic.

The Lutheran type of Protestantism is naturally found in Alsace, and in the little district of Montbeliard, which depended for centuries on a German Duchy, whence it has spread to Paris.

As a result of an awakening in religious feeling in Europe in 1848, certain Protestant Churches in France broke away from their State connection. At that time all the Churches, Catholic and Protestant alike, were, according to the Concordat of Napo-

leon, receiving a subvention from the State, and were therefore to a considerable extent, under its power. For example, no new church could be built without the permission of the State. The new church which thus came into existence was called the Eglise Libre, and as such exists to-day, though its following is not great. It has only forty-nine churches.

Again in 1870 another movement arose. This was a reaction against the liberal tendencies which were gradually showing themselves in the Church; and so to-day we find the different Churches designating themselves Eglises Reformées, which means that they have a liberal tendency, or Eglises Réformées Evangéliques, which means that they are conservative in outlook.

These two latter branches have now largely composed their differences, and it is not infrequent in the larger churches I know to find four *pasteurs* attached to the church, two of them of liberal tendency and two traditionalist, and were it not for their designations the congregation would be unaware of their differences.

About the beginning of the nineteenth century the Methodist Church was introduced into France, and established itself in Normandy and Brittany. The Salvation Army was started in 1881, and has in Paris a Men's Palace with 450 rooms and a Women's Palace with 750 rooms, and is proposing still further buildings. It is also to be found in all large towns.

The McColl Mission, started by a Scotch Pastor in 1872 in Paris, has branches at Rouen, Lille and Nantes, and does excellent work among the masses. The Baptist Church, supported by American Societies, has also a limited success in different parts of France.

It will thus be seen that Protestantism in France is very badly organized, and can with difficulty make headway against the splendid organization of the Roman Church.

The various groupings, however, are now beginning to see the unwisdom of this, and are drawing closer together, accepting the paradoxical statement that the principle of unity consists in permitting others to be different from yourself.

Nevertheless a keen observer assures me that the attempts which are now being made towards Reunion cannot bear fruit

for many years, owing to opposition of a certain die-hard minority in the different churches. But one step towards Reunion has been taken; a Protestant Federation of France has been formed.

This Federation defends the common interests of all the Protestant Churches in France, and represents French Protestantism officially, to the State and to the outside Churches. Lack of money, the general indifference to many of the old shiboleths of the past, the spread of atheism, the depopulation of the countryside (to which we shall refer later), and the new vitality in the Roman Church are, however, the most potent factors in forcing the leaders of Protestantism to come to terms with one another, or else to perish.

The organization of the Church, although there is not much of it, is not without interest. Each church has a *Conseil Presbyterial* consisting of the *pasteur* and certain laymen. The churches of each region have an annual Synod, made up again of *pasteurs* and representatives. This concerns itself with the admission of *pasteurs* to vacant cures and other questions of administration. The weakness of this administration will be seen when one learns that the different *pasteurs* inspect one another's churches, and report on the working of them to the Synod. It is difficult to imagine a more primitive or imperfect system. This represents, however, the French individualistic character. The Lutheran churches, drawing their inspiration from Germany, have an inspector in charge of each region.

Over all is the National Synod, which concerns itself with questions of doctrine and ordination of *pasteurs* and is the final Court of Appeal. Here again the individualistic principle deprives this Synod of real authority, while important churches, like those of Bordeaux and Nîmes, somewhat selfishly stand aloof, and refuse to acknowledge any outside authority or to contribute their quota to help struggling churches in other parts.

It cannot be denied that the Protestant Church in France has made considerable progress since 1801, when it was first given permission to exercise its worship freely. At that time it had only 120 parishes, and now there are 1,095. But the law of 1905, which involved the separation of Church and State, and which the Protestants at the time rather welcomed, as giving

them, they thought, a greater equality with their rival, by compelling them to be entirely responsible for the finances of their churches, has compelled them to join together some twenty per cent. of their parishes. In various other ways the State has intentionally limited their activities, especially as charitable societies.

Another difficulty faces Protestantism in France. It was especially strong formerly in the remote country districts, for it was just these districts which were too remote or inaccessible either for the persecutors to harry or for the inhabitants to emigrate from, as they did from so many towns and sea-board regions. To-day it is these very country districts which are being depopulated by the urge towards the city. Protestantism is therefore faced with the problem of conserving its scattered remnants of the countryside, and of preventing those who come into the towns from being engulfed by the prevailing secularism and Roman Catholicism. For French Protestantism this is a question almost of life and death. To meet the inrush into the towns, she has built some 114 churches in the last seventy years—nothing very excessive, it must be admitted. The traditional bareness of the Protestant churches still remains, and is not attractive to the young, especially when accompanied by a ritual equally sombre. The introduction of good organs, and better music and better choirs, and even some architectural adornment, into some of the larger and richer temples constitutes a modern development. The sermon, invariably much too long, and which sacrifices much in seeking to be eloquent, is still, however, the centre of the service, and fails to attract young people.

There are three faculties in which the *pasteurs* are trained, Paris, Strasbourg and Nîmes, each with its own particular orientation. For those who cannot attain to University status there are colleges at Paris, Nîmes and Glay. There is no lack of candidates for the ministry. My own experience, and my conversations with others, lead me to believe that the *pasteurs*, like many of the Nonconformist clergy in England, are far too much under the sway of their *Conseil Presbyterial*. Consequently, with certain notable exceptions, few of them develop much originality or have much influence outside purely parochial matters, while the stipends of nearly all of them are terribly inadequate. Their opportunities, too, are sadly limited, with but

one Sunday service and the Sunday school, and the preparation for the first Communion on Thursdays. Their churches are closed for all the rest of the week. This contrasts disadvantageously with the use which the Roman Catholic clergy make of their churches. It would contribute much to the advance of Protestantism in France if, following our English methods, they had bright evening services and religious gatherings for young people. The Protestants often claim that they are the intellectual portion of the nation, but their claim is hard, I think, to justify. For instance, in the University of Bordeaux, of which I have some knowledge, there is scarcely a Protestant on the staff. It is, however, true that Protestantism's stronghold is among the middle classes, and that the richest men in the community are often Protestant. Moreover, the Protestants have obtained a far larger quota of high positions in the State and in the business world than their number warrants.

In 1880 the State started the *École Laïque*, and this year great rejoicings were organized by the Government to celebrate its jubilee. The Protestants welcomed this step at the time, and gave up their schools to the State, believing that it would teach a needful modicum of religion. Many of them now regret this. The Roman Catholics, wherever possible, have to their credit put up a valiant fight to retain their schools, but the State now threatens to do away with these also and to have only the *École Laïque*. The Protestants have one *École Normale*, where girl elementary teachers are trained, but these chiefly go to missionary schools. The Protestants have also started schools, which are open from 4.30 to 6 p.m. in the afternoon, where children can go and do their home work. This, however, is hardly a very serious contribution to educational problems, especially when compared with the great efforts made by the Roman Church.

Protestantism in France, as elsewhere, has occupied itself largely with social activities. To assist it in this work it had the courage in 1841, at a time of awakening religious life, to create the order of deaconesses. Immediately two houses sprang up, one at Paris and the other at Strasbourg, which have become increasingly important in the good works they direct, both in the capital and the Provinces. Among its many philanthropic ventures, special mention should be made of the famous

homes of La Force, which shelter some of the most terrible cases of suffering humanity, and of the great homes for the deaf and dumb at St. Hypolyte, of which the French Church is justly proud.

The Y.M.C.A. (U.C.J.G.), the Y.W.C.A. (U.C.J.F.), the Students' Christian Movement ('*La Fédée*'), the Scouts (*Eclaireurs Unionists*), the Guides (*Eclaireuses Unionistes*) flourish in all the chief towns of France, under the aegis of the Protestant Church. The Scouts and Guides who are either Roman Catholic or *neutres* have different organizations.

No account of Protestantism would be complete which did not refer to the fine work done by 'La Cause' under the direction of Wilfred Monod, and which seems in many ways the most hopeful feature of Protestantism to-day. This organization, which was founded just after the War, publishes tracts, journals and newspapers. It has a school where it trains home missionaries, and sends them out to parishes which need help. It also gives every week a *conference* on the wireless at Paris. M. Monod himself is a tireless worker in the effort to awaken enthusiasm in the sleeping masses.

The missionary work of Protestantism in the French colonies and in other parts of the world is carried on at the cost of large sums of money raised annually at home.

A leading writer on Protestantism admits that in the religious awakening which has spread through France since the War, the chief credit must go to the Roman Church. But he claims that the Protestants, although a small minority, have played their part effectively, if only by compelling the Roman Church to stimulate personal piety, to eliminate abuses and superstitions, and to bring the Bible into greater prominence. He rightly remarks that the Roman Church in France is something very different from what it is in Spain, and that even in Brittany, where there is scarcely any Protestantism, it is different to what it is in La Drôme, where Protestantism is strong. Here we have perhaps the most important rôle that Protestantism can play in France, though by no means the only rôle, for there are undoubtedly those who find in its simplicity, its freedom and its search after intellectual truth, their only spiritual home.

BOOK REVIEWS

LUTHER IN RECENT RESEARCH*

There are figures in history about whom the final word can never be spoken. 'Such a figure, nobody can seriously doubt, is that of Martin Luther, whose personality and work require re-interpretation from age to age. These re-interpretations have, however, not always been eminently successful, largely by reason of the fact that our guides have been all too often theologians with numerous pre-suppositions and prejudices which seriously invalidate their claim to be scientific and impartial historians.

Professor Mackinnon in his four volumes often comes to grips with two writers of this type, particularly Heinrich Denifle and Hartmann Grisar, whose work on Luther has had a considerable influence in Europe. Of Denifle's *Luther und Luthertum*, Dr. Mackinnon says (Vol. I, vii), it 'is a bad example of the application of the dogmatic spirit to the interpretation of ecclesiastical history.' In the body of the work itself, Denifle is quoted about a dozen times, almost always with disapproval, as, for instance, when the learned Dominican sees too much in Luther's susceptibility to feminine influence, and makes Luther's version of his monastic experience the tale of an apostate monk. Similarly, Grisar sees in Luther's return to Wittenberg evidence of the Reformer's ambition and ulterior motives in 1511, and, in Dr. Mackinnon's words, 'betrays a rather exterior and mechanical knowledge of what Luther actually taught on justification' (Vol. I, p. 207).

In dealing with Luther's doctrine of justification by faith the Scots Professor replies vigorously to its critics. It is unfortunate that, in confuting the hostile and unjust criticism of Luther by Denifle and Grisar, Professor Mackinnon should not have fully realised how great is the contribution, especially of Denifle, towards our understanding of Luther. He never becomes so thoroughly unjust as Böhmer, who says, 'Luther's crass ignorance is Denifle's only new discovery' (*Luther*, p. 158, English translation). Yet Dr. Mackinnon allows that the Dominican has influenced for the better Protestant scholarship in this matter in virtue of his special knowledge of scholastic theology (Vol. I, viii), but his judgment is less impartial than that of Dean Rashdall, who recognized both the merit and the fault of Denifle (*Idea of Atonement*, p. 391). Hence, the German scholar's '*Quellenbelege über justitia Dei et Justificatio*' seems to have been largely, if not entirely, overlooked. The discussion, both in quantity and quality, on the connection of Luther with Scholasticism has not been improved thereby. True, we find some insistence on his attachment to Occam (e.g. Vol. I, pp. 20—21), but one cannot help feeling that the Schoolmen are not accorded their due, and that the writer lacks the ability of Holl in this particular field (*Gesammelte Aufsätze*) and Seeberg (*Dogmengeschichte*, Bk. iv).

Professor Mackinnon is far more just, and apparently more at home, with the Humanist movement. 'Without this preparation the work of Luther would hardly have been possible' (Vol. I, p. 249). Moreover, in his description of Luther's conflict with Erasmus about the Freedom of the Will, the arguments of both parties are given at some length, (Vol. III, pp. 244—273) and the excellence of both is maintained by Dr. Mackinnon in his comments. But with Dr. Murray's opinion (in his review of Vol. III in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. XXXI, No. 121, Oct., 1929, pp. 108-110)—that 'Dr. Mackinnon is just towards the Humanists in

* *Luther and the Reformation*. By Professor James Mackinnon, 1925—1930. Four volumes. (Longmans, Green. Price 16/- per volume.)

general, and to the greatest of them, Erasmus, in particular '—it is unlikely that agreement will be general. Here are two passages :

'What is lacking in him (Erasmus), compared with Luther, is just the power of passionate religious conviction, coupled with a dominating will power, which underlies and inspires both thought and action and expresses itself in assertion' (Vol. III, p. 230).

'Erasmus is a scholar and critic, rather than a thinker' (Vol. III, p. 266).

Did Erasmus lack 'the power of passionate religious conviction'? When one looks at such a production as *A Child's Piety* in the *Colloquies*, one feels that slumbering in him was a wealth of religious conviction that can too easily be overlooked.

In spite of the not altogether fair handling of Denifle and Grisar, the somewhat inadequate discussion of Luther's relations with Scholasticism, and, as it may appear, severity against Erasmus, it must not be assumed that Dr. Mackinnon finds no good in the Romanist historians, and all good in Luther. Merkle's work, *Reformations-Geschichtliche Streitfragen*, the production of a Würzburg Romanist historian, he allows to be eminently fair (Vol. I, vii), and it is, remarks the Professor, 'characteristic of liberal-minded Catholicism.' What Professor Mackinnon dislikes is 'a strange mentality that assumes absolute finality of judgment in matters historical or even theological' (Vol. IV, viii). There is no doubt that in this study he has himself assumed no such 'absolute finality of judgment' as he finds in others. Hence, even if, as Dr. Potter says of the work (*Hibbert Journal*, Vol. XXVIII, No. 4, July, 1930, pp. 763—765) it is 'on the whole . . . the traditional Protestant picture' that emerges—a none too accurate verdict, it seems—we are confronted with a *real man*. It is quite unnecessary to make of him a pathological case, such as both Denifle and Grisar sometimes appear to be concerned with, in order to understand Luther's limitations and failings. A real virtue of Professor Mackinnon's work is the unflinching delineation of such limitations and failings. Here are some expressions selected at random :

'Luther has no knowledge of, or any particular interest in, the many critical questions which exercise the mind of the modern exegete' (Vol. I, p. 169).

' . . . in thrilling theology to Augustine, he was imposing a dialectic and philosophical incubus on Christian thought, from which it would have been better if he had kept himself freer' (Vol. I, pp. 280—281).

Nor is Dr. Mackinnon unmindful of the violent abuse Luther heaped upon his opponents on occasion. Speaking of the Reformer's *Against the Papacy at Rome as founded by the Devil*, of 1545, he says:—

'Unfortunately, he allowed his wrath to explode in outbursts of vulgarity as well as of violence . . . Evidently his university education and monastic training had not refined the boor in him when it came to a violent altercation in the vulgar tongue . . .' (Vol. IV, pp. 142—143).

And, commenting on the famous Marburg Conference of 1529 between the Lutherans and the Zwinglians, he says:—

'Whilst himself protesting, in his controversy with his Roman Catholic opponents, against the error of making the dogma of transubstantiation an article of faith, he was untrue to his own contention in practically demanding acceptance of his own doctrine of consubstantiation as an essential of faith' (Vol. III, p. 328).

This candour has been by no means so pronounced in several of 'the traditional Protestant' pictures that occur to ones mind. Such as Köstlin's masterly objective study, which we are fortunate to have in an English translation, are, on the Protestant side, the exception rather than the rule. There does not seem to be much difference between Köstlin's verdict and Professor Mackinnon's, and hence one feels, especially in view of a recognition of some of Luther's shortcomings hitherto cited, that the following words are those of the historian seriously seeking a just appreciation.

'In this far-expanding movement we have the measure of Luther's influence. It is also the measure of the greatness of the man. He was one of those rare master spirits who create an epoch in religious history. In himself and his work, he stands forth as the embodiment of ideas, operating through a great personality, which creates and inspires a new order of things, compels the old order to bend and be renewed in the mould of its formative genius and its commanding will' (Vol. IV, p. 359).

This is certainly better history, and is truer to fact than Janssen's, with his undue emphasis on the fifteenth century bloom and the sixteenth century fading, or Denifle's or Grisar's. It was fitting that the reply to these German scholars should come from one whose German education is as sound as Dr. Mackinnon's. And it is good to know that Halle-Wittenberg recognised this scholar's contribution by conferring upon him, in connection with the celebration of the Quatercentenary of the 'Augsburg Confession' last year, an honorary degree. Edinburgh University followed the example of Germany in the last July graduation.

MANCHESTER COLLEGE,
OXFORD.

G. K. BROWN, Ph.D.

A BASKETFUL OF MEMORIES.*

Had it been possible, how gladly would Dr. Smiles have included in his *Self-Help* Thomas Okey, the Professor of Italian in Cambridge University who began his career as a poor basket-maker in Spitalfields some seventy-nine years ago. It is a cheering story, because it is a story of the triumph of virtue, of disinterested goodness combined with very high intelligence. It is a cheering narrative because it illustrates the enormous strides which have been made in the amelioration of the condition of the working classes in this country. The task of amelioration is far from completed, but it is as amazing to observe the advances that have been made as it is to imagine the conditions of filth, servitude and misery in which they lived eighty years ago. The biography is a tribute to the wonderful work accomplished by Toynbee Hall. What impelled Thomas Okey to accomplish all that he has done is to him a mystery. He loved reading, he loved foreign languages and he loved to be of service. He was highly intelligent, very industrious, unconquerably persistent and capable of great self-denial. He did not deliberately choose his career; it shaped itself for him. In summing up his reflections on his life, he writes:

'If the quality of happiness may be applied to *any* aspect of human life on this planet, the happiest period of my life—and by happiness I mean the satisfaction of heart and mind and peace of soul—has been when in my spare time I was absorbed in teaching, lecturing or organising, or other educational or social work in East London without any thought of material or personal advancement or gain. So true is it "that he who loseth his life shall find it."'

* *A Basketful of Memories: an Autobiographical Sketch.* Thomas Okey. (Dent, 1930. 6/- net.)

By many, Professor Okey would not be regarded as a Christian, but as a sceptic, perhaps even as an atheist, yet a personality and life more truly Christian cannot often be met with. He was of the company of the primitive socialist-secularists, which included such notable personalities as Bradlaugh, Hyndman, William Morris and Annie Besant. He rejoiced in the inspiring society of Arnold Toynbee and Bernard Shaw and many another bright particular star. Although a self-made man, no tinge of prejudice or boastfulness marks his narrative, which diffuses sympathy and insight, restraint and pleasantness: it is Prospero in *The Tempest*. We have seldom read a biography which has delighted us more, and our gratitude to its author equals our admiration of him.

H.D.A.M.

AN AGE-LONG STRUGGLE.

In his *Reaction and Progress in Religion*,* the Archdeacon of Chester refers with approval to the high value set by Matthew Arnold on the virtue of lucidity defined as 'the perception of the want of truth and validness in notions long current, that they are no longer possible, that they can serve us no more.' He himself in his book gives us an admirable illustration of this virtue. It is lucid in thought, lucid in style, lucid in arrangement.

He begins with a brief survey of religion before the Christian era, Jewish and non-Jewish. The principle of progress therein is exemplified by the ethical and spiritual view of God inculcated by the Hebrew prophets, the principle of reaction by externalism and a devotion to cultus divorced from morality. With the coming of Christ the highest prophetic ideals were fulfilled.

'What He did, as of chief importance, was to make clear the character of God. Renan was not wide of the mark when he said that the theology of Jesus was God conceived simply as a Father. Jesus taught men to think of God always as a Father, a Heavenly Father, i.e. possessing all the attributes of a father to a heavenly degree . . . To know God as their Father and to honour and love Him as such was to be the first care and aim of His children: everything else that was good would follow from that.'

Jesus showed no interest in the externals of religion. As a layman He had no admittance to the Temple Sanctuary.

'He showed no personal interest in the sacrifices that went on in the Temple, not even in the observance of the Day of Atonement.'

The Apostolic Age was one of unexampled progress, but it was not long before reaction began to set in. As Archbishop D'Arcy has pointed out, the effect of the imagery of the Apocalypse is 'to create an impression of the nature of God which is not in agreement with the teaching of Christ.' In course of time the predominant thought of the First Person came to be that of Ruler rather than Father. As knowledge of Christ and His teaching receded into the background, innate and inherited proclivities were given free play. Of this reaction and decay Canon Paige Cox sees a symbol in Michael Angelo's fresco in the Sistine Chapel where Jesus is depicted as a merciless Judge, before whose severity His mother shrinks in dismay. Its inevitable concomitant was the resurgence in the Middle Ages of sub-Christian doctrines of sacrifice, clearly exemplified in the doctrine of the Mass.

* *Reaction and Progress in Religion*. By W. L. Paige Cox, M.A., B.D. With a Foreword by R. H. Kennett, D.D. (Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons, Ltd. Price 5/-.)

When the Reformation came it was as a reaction against reaction, a recovery of New Testament principles. Though it was started and promoted by scholars, it found a warm welcome among the common people. The Anglican Church was essentially a Reformation Church, and its character as such was unquestioned until the Oxford Movement marked another swing of the pendulum. To the influence for good of the Oxford Movement in certain respects Canon Paige Cox pays generous tribute, but at the same time he holds that its development has led to a reversion to a pre-Christian type of religion and worship and an undue emphasis on cultus. To understand the reason for this reaction, we must take into account the fear bred of the collapse of Infallibilities in the nineteenth century before the assault of Liberal criticism. It is in Matthew Arnold that Canon Paige Cox sees the popular protagonist of Liberalism during the first stage of the movement. He holds that, though too hasty and exercising at first a subversive influence, his object, 'pursued with real and even passionate earnestness, was to rivet attention on Christ Himself, on the "inwardness" of His teaching and on its purifying and satisfying effect on the heart and character.'

Of the developments of the last half-century he writes:—

'We have lost much that it was painful to lose, but it was wood and hay and stubble, and the gold remains with a heightened brilliance in consequence. The effect of all this disturbance of old imagined grounds and supports of faith has been to concentrate attention anew on the Person of Christ, the teaching of Christ and the work of Christ, and to bring us back to the main position on which from the first He would have His disciples stand, His own witness to the Father, as set forth to the heart and conscience in His life and work.'

It is needless to say that one who so reads recent developments, though he sees clearly the dangers which threaten the progress of religion and does not seek to minimize them, still looks towards the morrow with a steady confidence. Not the least valuable aspect of his book is his evaluation of present tendencies and his indication of the dangers against which wisdom would bid us guard. Here his characteristic lucidity is invaluable. The book has as appendices a sermon preached in Chester Cathedral on the Lord's Supper and two very useful notes on 'This is My Body' and Eucharistic Sacrifice. It is a book to buy, to read, to re-read, and to lend.

G.L.H.H.

THE MASTERY OF SEX.*

'This book has a presumptuous aim. It aims at dealing with every sex problem a man or woman is likely to meet. It seeks to combine accurate science with applied religion' (P. xxii). These words from the Author's Preface make one expect a high competence; and one is not disappointed. In recent times we have had such a flood of literature dealing with sex problems, that many have expressed their belief that the reaction from Victorian taboos has gone too far. Many of these books—though written with honest intention—have 'protested too much' and so excited the wrong kind of stimulus. Some have been very frank but not very Christian; others have been Christian but very vague! And since the Church has done so much in the past to encourage the attitude that regards sex and sin as synonymous, we have the more anxiously looked for signs of her taking a leading part in the present re-action and thus preaching a sane, spiritual view of sex relationships.

* *The Mastery of Sex, through Psychology and Religion.* By Leslie D. Weatherhead, M.A. pp. 254+xxvi. (S.C.M., 1931 Price 5/-)

Here in *The Mastery of Sex* we have something approaching the ideal. It is written by one who has a wide knowledge of practical psychology and psycho-therapy : and he is assisted in some of the more technical details by Dr. Marion Greaves, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P. It is extremely frank and permeated with that human understanding and sympathy which those of us who know Leslie Weatherhead have come to expect from all his writings. It is extraordinarily comprehensive and in the discussion of such problems as those of repression, masturbation and its cure, etc., it is very practical. But, above all, it is written in a quietly reverent and spiritual way which lifts every problem with which it deals on to a high religious level. Thus it meets the need mentioned in a Foreword by Dr. Herbert Gray, of replacing Victorian taboos by clean knowledge and a moral standard based firmly on the facts of the case.

The author has the gift of constructive criticism as well as of an excellent literary style. He adds a useful Bibliography at the end of several chapters which will prove specially helpful to those who have to give advice and want to know where it is best obtainable. We have nothing but praise for this work and we confidently recommend it.

J. P. HODGES.

THE NEW HUMANISM.

The first thing we notice about this book*—which is as much a study of Humanism as of Theism—is the technical meaning of the former word. Dr. Horton is a 'theist who believes that in their major point of contention humanists are wrong,' but he has sufficient sympathy with them to make him a fair critic. But he writes for American readers who have become accustomed to the modern movement of ethical idealism which has converted humanism into a non-theistic religion. For English readers the word has still associations with Erasmus, for whom it was less a substitute for, than the expression of, his Christian faith. Dr. Horton noted this difference and traces the development of the new humanism from the 'frankly pagan humanism of Rabelais' through eighteenth century humanitarianism and nineteenth century positivism to the present movement.

We do not believe that the humanism of Rabelais was 'frankly pagan,' for there was an undercurrent of deep religious conviction running through his work : even in *Gargantua*, his most vigorous criticism of the monks is that they 'count plenty of paternosters . . . without thinking and without understanding, and that *I call mocking God* and not making prayers.' But certainly he believed that there is an inherent nobility in man which, given proper scope, prompts him to virtuous actions. And Dr. Horton shows how this belief was developed into the conviction that man is an end in himself, with nothing above or beyond him but his own ideals. Hence the realm of values is purely subjective and human, and humanism is left with a fundamental dualism of fact and value.

Dr. Horton contends that such a position is unstable and has no future : it must either drift into Futilitarianism, with its utter disillusionment, or make new terms with Christian theism. And so the last chapters in the book are spent in an attempt to find a synthesis. The chapter on 'The God in Human Experience' has much that is interesting by way of illustration and hypothesis, though it rather leaves the impression that we shall reach God at the end of an argument if only we go far enough. The other chapter, on 'The God of Christian Faith,' is the most interesting one in the book, and the illustrations from Studdert Kennedy and Baron Von

**Theism and the Modern Mood*. By Dr. W. M. Horton. (S.C.M., 1931. Price 4/- and 2/6.)

Hügel are well chosen, and his comments on them of considerable value. While this book is not an easy one to read, those who want to understand the outlook as well as to criticise the creed of the new humanism will find it well worth their while to study it.

J.P.H.

THE SEVENFOLD SPIRIT.*

'If you want to believe in the Holy Spirit,' said a lecturer a short time ago, 'look around you.' That, too, is the mood in which Mr. Raymond Calkins approaches his study of the Holy Spirit. He is convinced, as he says in a foreword, that this doctrine is a fundamental though neglected part of Christian theology: but instead of any formal discussion of the doctrine, he explores the spheres of life in which the Holy Spirit can be seen at work. On the few occasions when he does come down to doctrine we part company. For example, it is surely misleading, if not quite inaccurate, to state that 'In the New Testament, the Holy Spirit from the first had a separate reality, a personalness as distinct, as unique as that of the Son' (p. 103). If 'personalness' means 'personality,' then it is difficult to relate this to some of the Johannine and Pauline conceptions (e.g. *II Cor.* 3, xvii); whereas, if it is intended to be something less definite, then it cannot also be 'as distinct, as unique as that of the Son.'

But apart from this, Mr. Calkins' book is a scholarly and readable work, not couched in difficult language, but appealing with a variety of illustrations to everyday practical experience. The various chapters are each a complete study of some aspect of the work of the Holy Spirit: and we feel sure that many clergymen will welcome the kind of help that this book can give in the preparation of sermons.

J.P.H.

A CONFIRMATION GIFT BOOK.†

It is not easy to find the right kind of book to place in the hands of those who have been recently confirmed. There exist any number of Communicant Manuals, but most of them seem to take it for granted that what the youngster specially desires to know is which sins to confess and what devotions to use in a service. Thus the young communicant's introduction to 'religious literature' is often such as to close this line altogether for him. A book which is at once interesting and instructive for those approaching adolescence is rare. Here, however, is a book which deals with life and its practical problems. It avoids interpreting religion by a series of 'don'ts.' It deals with such subjects as Love, Service, Money, Humour, Prayer, etc., in a way which should stimulate young readers to think more and to read more about these things; and while it is simple and practical, it is also essentially spiritual. It is a pity that the last two chapters on Prayer and Communion are so compressed. The only other criticism which we desire to make concerns the price. While 2/6 is a reasonable enough price for the value of the book, it is, unfortunately, an impossible one for those who wish to give a copy to a large number of Confirmation candidates. Could not a cheaper edition be issued with this need in mind?

J.P.H.

**The Holy Spirit.* By R. Calkins. (S.C.M., 1931. Price 5/-.)

†*The Sacrament of Life.* By J. H. Grummitt, M.A. (S.C.M., 1931. Price 2/6.)

CORRECTION.

November *Modern Churchman*, p. 455, line 11 read *fifth* for *first*. Dr. Matthews' volume is the fifth in the Library of Constructive Theology, published by Nisbet and Co.

ED. M.C.

CORRESPONDENCE

SIR,

EUCCHARISTIC CONTROVERSY.

In reference to your editorial entitled 'An English Eucharistic Eirenicon', in the November issue, p. 419, I would call your readers' attention to Bishop Creighton's weighty remarks in *The Church and the Nation*, p. 260 f. He there indicates that there are two Eucharistic positions which the Church of England 'sets aside':—

- (1) The Zwinglian, which says it is 'only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves, one to another.'
- (2) The Roman, which teaches Transubstantiation, or 'the change of the substance of Bread and Wine.'

What is the real nature of the controversy to which these two statements refer? Christians do not differ about the importance of the Sacrament, its value, or the spiritual benefit which it conveys; they do not differ about what is essential for the Rite itself, if we put aside the question of the Christian Ministry. They differ about the mode in which the outward elements become the vehicle of the Spiritual Grace. Can this question be answered? Is it for man's good that it should be answered? The Church of England, resting upon sound learning, refuses to go beyond the words of Scripture and the practice of the Early Church. It defends the record of Scripture against two unwarrantable attempts to gratify man's curiosity, and leaves the Rite itself as it was left by our Lord. There is no compromise here, there is no mere reference to the nature of the evidence. If men choose to indulge in speculation on such a point, they do so for themselves and at their own risk; they must not claim to have their speculations incorporated into the system of the Church.

Such an attitude may doubtless seem to some minds cold and unsatisfactory; but where God has not spoken, man must keep silence. It is the duty of the Church to maintain the Divine reserve, and to uphold the Divine wisdom, against the specious demands of even the noblest forms of human emotion.

H. J. PALMER.

60 Church Walk, Worthing.
25th November, 1931.

SIR,

MODERNIST SERMONS IN THE METROPOLIS.

I shall be grateful if you will kindly allow me to draw the attention of your readers to the course of addresses which is to be given at St. Edmund's, Lombard Street (by kind permission of the Hon. Rev. J. G. Alderley), on the following dates:—

January 14th:—The Very Rev. THE DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S, D.D.
'The place of the Intellect in Religious Belief.'

January 21st:—Rev H. D. A. MAJOR, D.D.
'Why Congregations have declined.'

January 28th:—Rev J. S. BEZZANT, M.A.
'What is the Gospel.'

February 4th:—Canon C. E. RAVEN, D.D.
'The Person of Christ.'

The addresses will be given at 1.10 p.m.

T. J. WOOD.